

THE

61-73

Lutheran Quarterly



me II

AUGUST, 1950

Number 3

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume II

AUGUST, 1950

Number 3

CONTENTS

THEOLOGICAL TRENDS IN MID-CENTURY AMERICA.....	<i>Alvin N. Rogness</i>	243
INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW COMMON LITURGY.....	<i>Luther D. Reed</i>	253
THE COMMON HYMNAL: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES	<i>E. E. Ryden</i>	269
"Treasures"	<i>Victor E. Beck</i>	286
THE PHYSICIAN AND THE MINISTER	<i>Eric Steinthal</i>	287
HISTORICAL CRITICISM, THE BIBLE AND THE WORD OF GOD	<i>Eric Wahlstrom</i>	297
THE THEOLOGY OF THE "COMMON CONFESSION".....	<i>E. C. Fendt</i>	308

NOTES AND STUDIES

The State and Religious Education	Edward W. Uthe	324
The Social Theology of J. H. W. Stuckenberg	Harold A. Durfee	335
Extended Service	William C. Conradi	340

BOOK REVIEWS

Kepler, <i>Contemporary Thinking About Paul: An Anthology</i> (R. T. Stamm)	343
Knox, <i>Chapters in a Life of Paul</i> (R. T. Stamm)	345
Beyer, <i>Christ</i> (W. C. Berkemeyer)	349
Arndt, <i>From the Nile to the Waters of Damascus</i> (J. W. Heikkinen)	350
Lebreton and Zeiller, <i>The History of the Primitive Church</i> (I. Iversen)	350
Preuss, <i>Die Geschichte der Abendmahlsfrömmigkeit in Zeugnissen und Berichten</i> (J. K. Linn)	353
Watson, <i>Let God Be God!</i> (J. Sittler, Jr.)	354
Malmström, <i>En Farled</i> (E. M. Carlson)	355
Ullman, <i>Der Weg des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts</i> (O. Nothhacksberger)	355
Schlyter, <i>Karl Gützlaff als Missionar in China</i> (A. R. Wentz)	356
Rundblom, <i>Resans mål var Kina</i> (E. H. Wahlstrom)	357
Dietrich, <i>Världsstrategi. Kristliga Studentvärldsförbundet</i> (C. E. Lund-Quist) ..	358

BOOKS RECEIVED 359CONTRIBUTORS 360

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor

THEODORE S. LIEFELD

Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager

ANDREW S. BURGESS

Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

GETTYSBURG, PA.

Harvey D. Hoover

Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Paul J. Hoh

T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

C. G. Carfelt

Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

COLUMBUS, OHIO

E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DUBUQUE, IOWA

Bernard Holm

AIMS AND POLICY

- I. *Aims*: The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.
- II. *Policy*: The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

Theological Trends in Mid-Century America

ALVIN N. ROGNESS

THIS CENTURY, called by Churchill "the terrible century," opened with a great deal of optimism. The industrial world, sped on by unparalleled scientific research and discovery, had revolutionized the standards of living for western man. Europe, despite Bismarck's concentration of German might, was a well-knit and peaceful economic unity. America had emerged from adolescence into the full vigor of a young and powerful nation. The intellectual climate was definitely on the bright side. From Darwin's *Origin of Species* the philosophers and theologians had leaped to the conclusion that morally and spiritually, as well as biologically, the "push" of the universe was ahead. A vast, unseen spiral was in the very nature of things, sweeping man from the stage of the beast to the stage of the angel. There was much talk of the rational powers of man, and it was tacitly assumed that the more men developed intellectually the more goodness they would display in their common life together on the earth. Because poverty and war were unprofitable in this new interrelated world, therefore men would no longer tolerate either. Such was the naive hope of the 1900's.

Then came 1914, and 1917 with our entrance into war. But the optimism did not perish. We braced ourselves with slogans about having to fight one last war to end all wars, and about the necessity of saving the world for democracy. And, with the Armistice we settled back smugly to a task well done and prepared to enjoy a warless world in which all nations would follow the obvious course toward democracy. We were due for sharp awakenings, however. The rise of dictatorships, the "irrational" depression of 1929 and the gathering clouds of war sent our optimism reeling. And now, a punch drunk world, with the din of Hiroshima ringing in its

ears, has had all optimism driven from it. No one talks of inevitable progress any more. On the lips of scholars and housewives alike are the fears of new crises. A gloom of melancholy has settled down over the world. People everywhere speak of mankind having lost its faith.

LOSS OF WHAT FAITH?

Before we despair over the loss of faith, however, we must examine what sort of faith was lost. If we had faith in the wrong sort of thing, then its going may be a boon. Man is as much damaged by the wrong kinds of faith as he is helped by the right kinds. Merely to say that a man has lost his faith is not to describe his plight as either good or bad.

Surely, we have lost our faith in the inevitable triumph of democracy as a form of government. We no longer take for granted that everyone wants this kind of government, and our foreign policy has had to adjust itself to doing business with nations for whom it may not even be at present the best kind of government. Even within our own nation it does not seem so self-evident that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." Truth is not the fiat of the majority; for truth remains truth whether approved by "the people" or not.

More basic than our loss of faith in democracy is our reappraisal of the faith we had in man himself. The happy liberalism of the nineteenth century had placed unbounded hope in the native goodness of man. The old notion of man having a demonic quality immanently present was discarded as belonging to archaic theology. Sociology and psychology became the queens of study. The problem no longer was to bring man to God in a new birth; the issue was one of growth, clearing away ancient taboos and inhibitions so that the glorious humanism resident in man might blossom forth. Churches became social centers instead of shrines; clinics replaced pulpits, and theological seminaries trained psychiatrists. This entire trend, stemming from a non-biblical appraisal of man, has taken a sharp turn in mid-century America. The brutalities of two wars, exposing the naked cruelties of civilized man, has driven

us back to the traditional picture of man as a fallen creature, in desperate need of the intervention of God.

And, of course we have given up our faith in the inevitable nature of progress. No one talks now of there having been two wars to end all wars; men toss at night in fear of what seems a certain third war, and thereafter, if anything is left, of a fourth and a fifth. It is a terrible awakening to know that we live not in a state of progress, but in a state of constant crisis, and that we could lose in a month the accumulations of centuries.

THE THREAT OF NEW FALSE FAITHS

Having these comfortable props knocked out from under us, we reach out frantically for something to grasp. The current candidate is some type of collectivism. Having failed as individuals, operating separately in a free world, we propose to accomplish things by group action. There is now a mania for "social planning." We are inclined to give up our faith in a sort of automatic balance which individual righteousness and integrity can effect. There must be unions and coalitions and federations of the right kind if anything good shall come about. However important it may be to unite forces and juggle sociological factors, the damaging corollary of this new faith is an indifference to the importance of the qualitative goodness of the individual man. If man, individually, remains a fallen creature, no juggling of collectivisms will produce any other than a fallen order. The real tragedy lies in the church itself getting sidetracked and spending its pathos on matters of organization instead of preaching the regenerative Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Vast numbers in our day have given up faith in God, in the individual, and in the group, and have settled back to a grim resignation to the meaninglessness of all existence. They have given up the fight. A deep, dark nihilism has engulfed them. To eat, drink and make merry, if they can, seems the only sensible course left. One can at least have a faith in the sheer nothingness of life, and give oneself over in animal abandon to a non-reflective enjoyment of whatever pleasures chance to come before certain death draws

the curtain. Having no cause worth fighting for, man turns to looting and pillaging. Play while it is day, the night cometh when no one can play. Get what you can when you can, whether another man's business or wife or life, it matters not. The cautious will loot with refinement to avoid collisions, if possible. But all talk of giving your life to something is gone.

Much more than any of us like to think, this is the mood of the day. From the wayside trucker who takes his beers and women where he may, to the statesman whose eye sees only the next election, to the farmer who cannot think beyond the next market report,—throughout society this feverish pursuit of immediate pleasure or gain has infected all life. We who face a cross-section of American people on Sunday morning will find this mood currently the most entrenched stronghold of Satan. It is not simply that man by nature is selfish. His selfishness is now justified by the prevailing faith in the meaninglessness of all things. He is not interested in how the world might be saved, simply because he does not know *why* it should be saved. The age shrugs its corporate shoulders and smirks, "So what?" And you cannot marshal men to fight unless you can present some overwhelming cause worth battling for. For want of such a cause, man inevitably turns to pillaging. Perhaps not since the days of the apostles has the church faced as disillusioned a hearing.

SOME HOPEFUL SYMPTOMS

This indifference to the question "how shall the world be saved?" does have some deeper rumblings, however. There are people waiting to listen if you propose an answer to the question of "why it should be saved." If you will leave the field of techniques, and come to terms with questions of beliefs, you may get a hearing. I believe men are crying, here and there, for some commanding belief. It was not so in the opening of this century. We had accepted almost as axiomatic that it did not matter what a man believed, so long as he behaved himself. In fact, we even went so far as to say that a man could believe anything, so long as he was in earnest about it. We wanted him to be sincere. We are not that naive now.

In fact, the more sincere a man is in his belief in communism, for instance, the more dangerous we think he is. The less sincere he is, the less we fear him. We understand now that "belief" is a very basic phenomenon, and that as a man believes in his heart, so is he. If he does not believe right, however sincere he is, he will not long behave right.

This reevaluation of the nature of "belief" is a hopeful sign. If the church has an all-encompassing belief, some commanding message—a Gospel which embraces all of life, individual and corporate, temporal and eternal, the church will find listening ears. Anything short of that will fail to come to grips with the spiritual apathy created by modern nihilism. A flaming supernaturalism has a better chance today than it has had for a century.

WHENCE AUTHORITY?

As I face my congregation I sense that they want the pulpit to speak with authority. This desire was not fashionable at the opening of the century: it was then in better taste for the preacher to state the pros and cons of the argument and leave the verdict to the sovereign reason of the pews. It was common rhetoric to say, "I submit that this is so" instead of "thus saith the Lord."

Inasmuch as the yearning for authority is immanent in the hearers of the day, the question of the seat of authority is receiving more theological attention than it has for some time. Does it lie in the Person of Jesus Christ? Is it in the church itself? Is it with the written documents, the Bible, or the Word? Within Lutheran circles, surely, the doctrine of the Word is bidding for renewed examination.

It is not my intention, even were I able, to examine the variant emphases entertained in a discussion of the authority of the Word. I merely point to the causal relation between the theological question and the surging demand of the day for some voice of authority. The age is wearied over "argument about it and about," and will listen only to him who claims to speak with an authority beyond his own reason or the reasoning of the scholars. The pulpit that

boldly declares "thus saith the Lord" is far more likely to capture a hearing than one which deals in polite and inoffensive discussion.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

I sense also a rising interest in the nature of the church. The recent war enforced the conviction that the church was an historic phenomenon not to be dismissed lightly. The uprooting of families and nations often drove men to the refuge of a spiritual fellowship which in happier days they had quite overlooked. The doctrine of "the communion of saints," the "body of Christ," or the church has become a Protestant passion. Pressed on the one hand by the neatly fixed ecclesiology of Roman Catholicism and on the other by the urgency of the ecumenical movements, every thinking Christian is impelled to form some idea of the essential nature of the church.

Within the liberal tradition of American Protestantism very few had bothered themselves with the intrinsic character of the church. In fact, the church had descended to a parallel place with the lodge, the Rotary Club, or a university forum. And often a church's excellence was measured in terms of its service to the community and its organizations; its role was to be an arm of the Boy Scouts, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Red Cross. Now, in mid-century America, there is a universal insistence on the fact that "the church shall be the church." The church shall not be appraised by how well it conforms or adapts itself to the community; the community shall be measured by how it conforms to the message and the principles of the church.

Protestantism, irritably awakened to the central place it had surrendered and eager to recapture its own self-consciousness as a church, is forced to formulate some doctrine of the church. It must be something other than the two hundred or more denominations and sects that parade as the church, and it cannot be merely a visible hierarchy. To formulate afresh the third article of the Apostles' Creed is one of the most insistent of present theological tasks.

THE ATONEMENT

To preach to fallen man in a fallen order has driven the church to a reexamination of its central doctrine, the atonement. The Protestant pulpit of a quarter century ago had struck a plateau in the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. The mood now is vastly altered. How can you speak the beatitudes to an age in the grip of something demonic? The preaching of the Law and the Gospel, bringing the Holy Spirit's power to bear on the hearer with redemptive and regenerative effect, seems much more pertinent than it did a half century ago. The theology of Paul was not at all popular a few years ago; today it looms up as vitally relevant. To interpret the work of Christ for the individual and for society has become the central task of the preacher again.

This plunges the church full into the doctrine of the atonement. Within the Lutheran Church the traditional picture given by Anselm in *Cur Deus Homo* has been the most widely used. The atonement was a juridical act, in which God offered His own Son as a sacrifice, an expiation, for the sins of the world. Man was a rebel, a criminal, guilty of high treason against God, and subject to the penalty of eternal death. What he needed was pardon or forgiveness. And this God could not give without violating and destroying the moral character of the universe unless a suitable payment were made. Since man could not make it, even if he would, God Himself had to provide it. In Christ's life and death and resurrection—this mighty act of God in redemption—this pardon was provided. And everyone who does not reject this work in unbelief is justified, not by virtue of his own offerings of righteousness, but by Christ's offerings appropriated by the sinner in faith.

Granted that any pictorial attempt to describe the work of Christ must fall short of encompassing the wonder of the work, this traditional picture had the virtue of pointing to man's deepest plight as being "guilt" and his profoundest need being "forgiveness."

Another picture used is that of battle. Man is the defeated one, in need of victory. And Christ, as the Lord of Hosts, wins the victory and imparts this triumph to the defeated one in faith.

Luther's great hymn, "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God," is an admirable poem on this theme. This picture has more dynamic quality than the juridical.

The elemental need of man is the forgiveness of sins, for "where there is forgiveness there is also life and salvation." The Scriptures may give rise to many pictures in defining the work of Christ for man. He is the Light of the world, giving wisdom. He is the Lord of Hosts, giving victory. But supremely, He is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. And this involves first taking away its guilt through forgiveness. The cross continues to shed abroad its strange power because men have discovered that there, and only there, their sins have been washed away.

This much is sure, that if the preacher wants to reach modern man with a message that reaches the heart of his problem, he must preach the atonement.

THE NATURE OF FAITH

Fourth, I believe we are undergoing a wholesome examination of the foundations of faith. Not many years ago the conventional Protestant theologian's chief concern was to make Christian faith palatable to reason, or to the scientific method. Today there is almost a reckless defiance of the canons of reason. Instead of currying the favor of reason, we almost gloat over the irrationality of faith. There is danger in both extremes. Certainly faith is not an obvious conclusion which can be deduced from verifiable evidences. It is not always obvious, for instance, that God is good. Nor is the faith a well defined body of doctrine screened from Scripture and comprehended by the powers of the mind.

The Christian faith basically cannot be contrary to truth, whether it be the truth of reason or the truth of revelation. Faith really starts where reason leaves off, and reason cannot therefore either prove or disprove its content. Faith is a leap, at a total risk; but it is a leap which fallen man cannot make by any resident power inherent in him. Faith is the product of the Holy Spirit's work in

the human heart, through Word and Sacraments. No man can call Christ Lord except by the Holy Spirit.

Much theological controversy could be divested of its divisive character if we could remember that the faith in a man's heart is always the work of the Holy Spirit, and not the end result of dialectics and definitions. If the theological world can in the next years spend as much passion in the study of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit as it has spent on some lesser areas of Christian truth, the next years might be Pentecostal ones for Christendom.

THE OTHER-WORLDFLY NOTE

Finally, mid-century America has a new ear for "other-worldly" preaching. The disappearance of faith in progress as a certain pattern for history has impelled us to look for something outside of history as an anchor. If this is the end of the age, what then? Is all lost? We seek anew for an answer, and find it in the New Testament hope. Paul apparently had little hope for his age, the Graeco-Roman. In fact, his gallantry had no connection whatever with his specific age. Another Kingdom, the age to come, when this present order of time and space would be replaced by "the new heaven and the new earth"—this hope it was that spurred him on. Meanwhile, pending its fulfillment, this "other-worldly" Kingdom was present among men with open doors for anyone who would enter.

Entering this imperishable Kingdom, however, does not exempt a man from the teeming tasks of time. On the contrary, it plunges him back into the innumerable situations of time with a new urgency. This world, impermanent as it is, is God's world. Today it is the only corner of the vineyard, the only sector of the battlefield, where we have assignment. We need not become panic-stricken over the prospect of this world going to pieces, because we "look to the city with the foundations"; on the other hand, so long as we have life every aspect of this world's life becomes an opportunity for dispatching the will of Him Who is Lord of both earth and heaven. The other-worldly dimensions of our faith do

not relax our stewardship for this impermanent earth; it is rather intensified.

A sound eschatology does not free man from the responsibilities of earth; it only adds dignity and meaning to all the tasks of earth. Elevated to the high station of citizenship in the eternal Kingdom, man turns to earth under daily compulsion to translate into the economic and political life of earth the transcendent qualities of justice and mercy which are his as an heir of eternal life.

Our people need desperately to have their destiny lifted above the swirling eddies of this world's fortunes or misfortunes. Only by being thus "detached" from earth can they live fearlessly and fruitfully on the earth.

Introduction to the New Common Liturgy¹

LUTHER D. REED

THE Common Liturgy and Hymnal is the fruit of endeavors which began in 1944 when the United Lutheran Church resolved to delay the final revision of its Hymnal to seek "the fullest possible co-operation with other Lutheran bodies, in the hope of producing, as nearly as proves feasible, a common Lutheran Hymnal in America. Member Churches in the National Lutheran Council accepted this invitation and appointed representatives who organized a Joint Commission in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, early in 1945.

The Commission determined to prepare a standard English hymnal of literary and musical quality which should witness to the continuity and catholicity of the Church's life and which, in full agreement with Lutheran doctrine and preserving the finest of our heritages, should be suitable for use by our congregations in America today. The Commission reported a plan and a list of hymns which the co-operating Churches approved in 1946.

The success of this effort led representatives of the Augustana Church to suggest the appointment of a similar Commission on the Liturgy. The Presidents of the Churches approved and appointed representatives who met in Chicago, February 25, 1946, and recommended that all the Lutheran Churches in the country be invited to co-operate in the preparation of a Common Liturgy. The Missouri Synod, through its President, declined the invitation. Representatives of the other Churches met in Pittsburgh, June 26, 1946, and organized the Commission on the Liturgy with eighteen members. Intensive work by individuals, subcommittees,

1 Prepared for the Common Lutheran Liturgy and printed in the *Quarterly* by permission of the Joint Commission.

and the Commission itself, resulted in the presentation of an extensive and unanimous report which the co-operating Churches approved in 1948.

The Lutheran Churches in America are in process of becoming the Lutheran Church in America, a blend of many strains. The older generations worshipped in the languages of their fathers, using liturgies and hymnals authorized by Lutheran State Churches in Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Slovakia, Hungary, etc., or English translations and adaptations of the same. While breathing a common spirit and containing many common forms, these Services were quite diverse in character. The preparation and adoption of the Common Service in 1888 helped to resolve this confusion.

This admirable work, a product of the confessional and liturgical movement which revived the church in Europe and America in the nineteenth century, was prepared by a Joint Committee representing the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South. The plan of work and the excellence of its text commended it to all groups. Within a relatively few years it was included in the official Service Books of practically all the Lutheran Churches in the country, and translations in Telugu, Japanese, and Spanish carried it into the mission fields.

The principle or "Rule" which guided the framers of the Common Service, was: "the common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century, and when there is not an entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight." This decision to reproduce in the English language the consensus of the purified liturgies of the classic Reformation century, placed the project upon an objective, historical basis which limited the assertions of personal taste or preference. Thus, with few exceptions, the Common Service in its newest parts is as old as the time of the Reformation; in the order and great body of its material, it represents the pure service of the Christian Church of the West from the earliest times.

Dr. Beale M. Schmucker, in his scholarly Preface to the Common Service of 1888, describes the way in which the Reformers

early undertook to revise and purify the Liturgy of the Church, and introduce the language of the people in worship. Luther's *Formula Missae*, an evangelical revision of the Latin Mass, appeared in 1523. This was important in stating principles as well as suggesting forms. In 1524 the *Teutsch Kirchenambt* was introduced at Strassburg and in 1525 the Doeber Evangelical Mass at Nürnberg. In the same year Conrad Rupff, the Chapel Master of the Duke of Saxony and Johann Walther, his assistant and successor, aided Luther in arranging music for the latter's German Mass (*Deutsche Messe*) which appeared in print early in 1526. Bugenhagen's Order for Brunswick was completed in 1528; that for Hamburg in 1529; and his Danish Order in 1537. In Sweden, Olavus Petri published his Manual, which provided evangelical forms for Baptism, Marriage, Visitation of the Sick, and Burial, early in 1529. This was the first Protestant work of its kind, and Petri followed it promptly with his important and relatively complete Swedish Mass in 1531. Two years later, 1533, two very influential Orders were authorized in Germany—the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order prepared by Brenz and Osiander for the prosperous and art-loving city of Nürnberg; and the Order for the city and jurisdiction of Wittenberg which superseded the personal Orders of Luther and Bugenhagen, and thereafter was used by them. During the next few years many cities and provinces in Germany issued similar Orders. Many of these retained portions of the Service in Latin but all sought to provide acceptable forms in the vernacular.

These Orders at first differed considerably from each other. But, after a time, there appeared in Saxony, northern Germany, and Scandinavia particularly, a definite and generally accepted type of liturgy. The Order of Government and Worship which Justus Jonas and his associates Spalatin, Cruciger, and Myconius prepared in 1539 for the Duchy of Saxony provided a typical standard Lutheran service with which the liturgies of Mecklenburg, Lüneburg, Calenberg and other North German cities and States in their successive editions were in close agreement.

The sixteenth century services were primarily translations

and revisions of the medieval Latin liturgies, with a few new features. Purity of doctrine was carefully guarded; the sermon was given increased importance; the calendar was simplified; church-song took a new flight; while the ancient musical intonations of the minister and the finest music of the choir were carefully preserved. An Order of Public Confession, the Prayer of the Church, and Exhortation to communicants and a few new Lessons and Prayers were introduced. In general, however, the whole outline and structure of the service of the Western Church for a thousand years before the Reformation was preserved, only that which was contrary to the pure teaching of Holy Scripture or otherwise objectionable being removed.

The whole series of Introits, Collects, Epistles and Gospels, which for the most part had finally been completed in the reign and domain of Charlemagne, was continued with slight changes in the German and Scandinavian liturgies of the sixteenth century. From these it came into the Common Service of 1888, and it now constitutes the basic liturgical "proper" of the Common Liturgy. There are but few of the Sunday collects which have not been in continuous use for more than twelve hundred years. With some differences in the days for which they are appointed, most of these beautiful prayers are now in use in all Roman Catholic Churches, though only in Latin; in the Lutheran Churches of Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the United States, and wherever scattered throughout the world; in the Church of England throughout the Commonwealth of Nations, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. Here is a notable example of ecumenicity and unity in the liturgical field.

In the providence of God the Lutheran Church, first of all, revised and purified the services of the Church and translated them into the vernacular at the time of the Reformation. The Lutheran revision of the Communion Service had been issued in many editions, had been tested by more than twenty years of continuous use in many States and cities, and, at Luther's own instigation, had even been provided with varied musical settings for Sundays and Festivals, and had been issued in a superb folio volume, before the

English revision of the old Service was made by the Church of England in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI in 1549.

The close agreement between this first Prayer Book of the Church of England and earlier Lutheran liturgies on the continent is explained by the fact that the Sarum and other Anglican Missals, from which the English revision was made, agreed almost entirely with the Bamberg, Mainz, and other German Missals, and with the Swedish and Danish Missals, differing with them in important respects from the Roman Missal. Archbishop Cranmer also, Primate of the Anglican Church, was intimately acquainted with the Lutheran Reformers and particularly with their work in the liturgical field. He had spent a year and a half in Germany in conference with theologians and princes, and had lived in the home of the Lutheran pastor Osiander when the latter was at work on the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order, in 1532.

Two Lutheran professors who were called to the English universities also had a part in the preparation of the English Prayer Book. One of these, Martin Bucer, had been associated with Melancthon and others in the preparation of Archbishop Hermann's Reformation of Cologne, 1543. Also during the years from 1535 to 1549, there had been constantly recurring conferences between the Anglican and Lutheran divines and rulers. It is thus not strange that the first and best Prayer Book of the Church of England should have so closely followed the Lutheran use as to present few divergencies from it. Changes, introduced in the Second Prayer Book of 1552 in response to Calvinistic and Zwinglian influences marred this agreement, and have persisted in many instances to the present day. Nevertheless it is important to note that these two daughter Churches of the Reformation, the Lutheran Church on the continent and the Church of England, pursued parallel paths in purifying and preserving the services of the church of the olden time, and that each, according to its genius, has further enriched the worship of succeeding generations.

The Common Service was the first generally accepted attempt to reproduce the consensus of the Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century in the English language. As an important feature

of the churchly revival of the nineteenth century it contributed greatly to the development of church consciousness and unity throughout the church in the Western Hemisphere, in spite of the fact that numerous changes in text were independently made by all the Churches which accepted it. Not a single Church today publishes or uses the Common Service precisely as it was adopted in 1888. The Common Service Book of the United Lutheran Church in 1918 filled out some of the outlines with additional Propers, extended the selections of Psalms and of Collects, and added a series of historic Graduals and a body of General Rubrics. Other Churches—the American, Augustana, Evangelical Lutheran, Missouri Synod, etc.—omitted certain parts of the original text and expanded other parts with alternate Collects, Lessons, Graduals, etc. Some of these changes are minor, others are important. Apart from other considerations, these variations in a professedly “Common Service” call for study and reconciliation.

Other considerations, however, are even more important at the moment. The incorporation of all Lutheran groups within the fabric of American life, the restriction of immigration and the rapid process of Americanization, the leveling influence of the public schools, the success of many co-operative endeavors, as well as the acceptance of common confessional standards, not to mention the experience of two world wars, have made it clear that the Lutheran Churches in America are one in faith and destiny. Knit together of many strains and appreciative of proud heritages from other centuries and lands, they seek to bear united testimony to Christian truth in this our own country and time. The use of common liturgical forms will accelerate this historical process and help produce a united Church of distinctive character and strong individuality, differing in many respects from other communions in our own country and also from the Lutheran State Churches in Europe from which its component parts originally sprang.

These psychological and practical considerations, however, were not uppermost in the minds of the scholars who prepared the Common Liturgy and Hymnal. After convincing themselves that there was hope of eventual agreement, their chief thought

was to produce a representative Service Book, in full agreement with Lutheran doctrine and life, with text and music of superior quality, and in all respects a work suitable for the public services of our congregations. The final appraisal of the Book will have to do with this essential character and quality rather than with its usefulness as an instrument of Church unity, however important this latter may be.

While the Common Liturgy rests squarely upon the foundations laid by our spiritual fathers in Germany and Scandinavia four centuries ago, it contains important features which mark it as a product of the new world and the present time. The Church Orders of the sixteenth century were local or provincial reforms of the Roman Rite intended for use in a single kingdom or duchy, a city like Nürnberg, Strasburg, Cologne or Hamburg, or a town like Wittenberg or Göttingen. The theologians and jurists who edited them knew little of the worship of the Early Church or of any other part of the Universal Church. The framers of the Common Service in the nineteenth century also had their limitations. In the confused state of the church of that day, the only hope of common agreement lay in the adoption of an objective Rule which considerably limited their freedom.

We of this generation are not living in the sixteenth century or the nineteenth. Pioneer conditions no longer obtain and sectional differences are rapidly disappearing. All Lutheran groups are conscious of maturity and solidarity in this our western world and are contributing notably to its culture as well as to its political and economic development. The confessions which witness to our unity in faith give us a greater freedom than the framers of the Common Service felt they could accept. The Apology to the Augsburg Confession (VIII:38, 39) says "we maintain the old traditions in the Church for the sake of usefulness and tranquility," but the Formula of Concord (I:10:4) adds, "we believe, teach and confess that the Church of God of every place and every time has the power, according to its circumstances, to change ceremonies (instituted by men) in such manner as may be most useful and edifying."

The Common Liturgy well exemplifies both these principles. The historic principle finds expression in the fundamental structure of the Liturgy with its proper appointments for the Church Year. The principle of freedom and timeliness is well expressed by the new material which has been introduced, and which, though proportionately small in volume, is important in content and character. Four distinct ideas, taken together and held in balance, justify these new features: the decision to make changes suggested by practical experience in the use of the Common Service during the past sixty years; an awareness of contemporary conditions and needs which should be met on the liturgical level; an ecumenical outlook which appreciates values in special features of the formal worship of other communions; and a willingness to profit by the achievements of modern scholarship in recovering pertinent liturgical gems from the life of the Early Church.

Important new textual features are the revised Kyrie, the series of Old Testament Lessons, the Prayer of the Church, the Eucharistic Prayer, the revised and enlarged collection of Collects and Prayers, and the comprehensive series of Occasional Services. The musical settings to the Liturgy and the excellent body of hymns and hymn tunes are also significant features of this work not found in the Common Service of 1888.

The simple three-fold Kyrie is a fragment of an original meaningful responsive prayer which, as the first prayer of The Service, immediately followed the entrance Psalm (Introit) in the liturgies of the Early Church. This prayer was not penitential in character. It was universal in scope, with broad and objective intercessions for the peace of mind of the worshippers, for the well-being of the Church, the welfare of the city and the government, the peace of the world, etc. Each petition or intercession, recited by the minister, was followed by the simple response, *Kyrie Eleison* by the people. In the early Middle Ages some of the intercessions in this litany type of prayer were transferred to a later place in the service, and only the simple response of the people, the *Kyrie Eleison*, was kept at this place and sung responsively by the minister and the choir.

Separated from the petitions which had given it meaning, the simple *Kyrie Eleison* came to be regarded as a cry of penitence. Medieval symbolism gave it a nine-fold form with three petitions addressed to each member of the Holy Trinity. Luther's Orders established the simpler three-fold form, but failed to restore the fuller text or the objective character of the prayer. The Anglican Prayer Books perpetuate the medieval penitential conception by connecting the Kyrie with the recitation of the Decalogue ("Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law"). Regarded merely as a cry of penitence, the simple Kyrie is repetitious and out of place following the Confession and Absolution. Its fragmentary text gives no hint of the real character and content of the original prayer. The restoration of the fuller and historically valid form gives meaning and life to this element in the Service. The restored petitions have peculiar pertinence for our own time and for all time, and they follow the Confession and Absolution with entire propriety. Their sincerity and breadth of spirit lift the thought of worshippers above concern for self to levels of unselfish intercession for others.

The inclusion among the Propers of a series of Old Testament Lessons, with the indication of a specific one which may be read before the Epistle, is a return to the universal practice of the Early Church. Except for the Psalter, the Old Testament Scriptures have largely dropped from formal Lutheran worship. The restoration of this primitive Christian use, with its wealth of history and prophecy, should strengthen and enrich our Services today.

The Prayer of the Church is the traditional General Prayer, with a better name and text. The latter preserves the essential ideas of the *Allgemeines Kirchengebet* which appeared in a variety of forms in the liturgies of the sixteenth century. Its simple, idiomatic phraseology is an improvement upon the stilted translations of excerpts from various Church Orders which first appeared in the Church Book in 1868, and was carried over into the Common Service of 1888.

The Eucharistic Prayer is a feature found not only in all early Christian liturgies but in the Service Books of practically every Christian communion today—whether Eastern, Roman, Anglican, or Protestant. A general pattern for such a Prayer was set in the fourth century and consisted, with some variation in the order of parts, of a post-Sanctus with continuing notes of adoration; a recital of the Dominical Words; the *Anamnesis*, a review of the suffering, death, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord; an exalted ascription of praise and thanksgiving; the *Epiclesis*, or Invocation of the Holy Spirit; and a petition for the realization of the spiritual blessings of the Sacrament by all communicants. During the medieval centuries false doctrine and improper ceremonies disfigured this Prayer.

All the Reformers denounced the corrupted text and several attempted revisions, Archbishop Cranmer's draft for the English Prayer Book being a notable example. Luther's radical reform at this point was in sharp contrast to his otherwise conservative procedure. His two Orders of Service omitted the entire Canon except the Words of Institution. These he retained in connection with the Lord's Prayer, directing that both should be chanted aloud. The majority of the Church Orders followed his example, and the bare recital of the Verba without a vestige of the prayer forms in which the Words of Institution had always been imbedded, came to be recognized as a Lutheran peculiarity, unique in liturgical history.

Scholars in all periods have questioned this solution. Several sixteenth century Orders surrounded the Verba with pure prayer forms. Among these were the Kantz Order, 1522; the Strassburg Order, 1525; Pfalz-Neuberg, 1543; Austria, 1571; as well as the English Prayer Book, 1549. The liturgical revival of the past century produced similar forms in Loehe's Agende, 1844; the German liturgies of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1855, and of the Joint Synod of Ohio, 1863; Bavaria, 1879; and Russia, 1898. The liturgy of the Lutheran Church in India, 1936, has a fully developed Eucharistic Prayer. The new liturgy of the Church of Sweden, 1942, has a briefer form. Bishop Brilioth of that

Church says Luther's "operation left a gaping void . . . a central problem of the Lutheran Rite still awaits solution."

Believing that historical, doctrinal, and devotional requirements can best be met by a properly worded Eucharistic Prayer, the Common Liturgy provides such a Prayer which includes within its structure the narrative of the Institution as in practically all other Christian liturgies, ancient and modern.

This prayer preserves the historic form and unity of the Communion Office, which, from the Preface to the Lord's Prayer, and including the narrative of the Institution, is one great act of prayer and thanksgiving. The separation of the Words of Institution from their historic connection, and their bare recital without liturgical introduction or conclusion, as in the text of the Common Service, makes a definite break in this act of prayer, even though the rubric requiring the minister to face the altar shows that the church regards the entire action as a prayer. Popular understanding, however, believes that the prayer form concludes with the Sanctus and the Lord's Prayer (according to the present arrangement); and that the recitation of the Verba is something different—either a solemn proclamation or warrant for the celebration of the sacrament, or a formula of consecration.

The Eucharistic Prayer incorporates the Words of Institution within its structure just as many collects and prayers recall passages of Scripture and use them for the foundations of their petitions. The Dominical Words lose none of their grace and power as they are thus recalled in an act of remembrance and devotion in the larger framework of prayer. The traditional form and unity of the liturgy are preserved, and the church is protected from suspicions concerning mechanistic and materialistic conceptions of the Sacrament which seem implicit in the repetition of the Verba alone. The prayer continues and expands the thought of the Preface and the Sanctus. These exhort to thanksgiving but give no reason for thanks except the limited references in the Proper Prefaces.

The Eucharistic Prayer is a pure text in the order of the Creed. Addressed to God the Father, it recalls the life and re-

demptive work of our Lord and invokes the presence and aid of the Holy Spirit. It makes manifest, as no other single part of the Service does, the meaning of the Sacrament, its relation to the Last Supper and the total significance of the redemptive ministry of our Lord. It is in full agreement with the example and command of Christ Who "blessed" the bread, and "gave thanks" for the cup. All of this rich and exalted devotional material is compressed within a few brief paragraphs in the form and mood of prayer, which is the only way in which we can address God.

Those who do not wish to use the Eucharistic Prayer and who desire to continue the present order, may use the alternate form authorized by the Churches. This consists simply of the Words of Institution and the Lord's Prayer, without introduction or conclusion, and in this order.

The section, Collects and Prayers, has been prepared on the basis of the seventy-seven items in the Common Service of 1888 and additional prayers in the Common Service Book of 1917. This material has been thoroughly revised and expanded to meet modern conditions and needs. Many prayers from early Latin sources and the German Church Orders have been omitted. Sixty-five new prayers from ancient and modern sources in Europe and America have been included, some having been composed by members of the Commission.

The section on The Occasional Services is unusually complete. Its preparation involved many difficulties because of the great variety in the forms and customs of the co-operating Churches. Agreement in the text of The Service and of Matins and Vespers was easier to attain because these services are based upon revisions of the medieval Missals and Breviaries, Latin service books which were relatively uniform in all European lands before the Reformation. Lutheran reform in all countries in the sixteenth century proceeded along parallel lines. In consequence our Churches in America had a common order and a great body of common liturgical material in the matter of these principal public services.

The Orders for Baptism, Confirmation, Confession, Marriage, Burial, Ordination, and other Occasional Services, however, are based upon extensive revisions of the ancient Latin Manuals or Rituals for parish priests, and of the Pontifical, the service book for bishops. These books differed greatly in different areas in medieval times. Many local and national peculiarities persisted in the different European countries after the Reformation and came in translation into the service books of our Churches in America. Other differences are due to the uneven results of the confessional and liturgical revival which swept across Europe a century ago. Some Lutheran countries made quite full recoveries of lost or neglected material, while others made only partial recoveries. In every country much new material was improvised. As a result the Orders for these Occasional Services as found in our present service books in America differ greatly in character and completeness. Many are fully developed along historic lines; others are simple, even rudimentary in form.

The texts proposed by the Commission are inclusive in character. The fundamental pattern of each Order, practically identical in all the Churches, has been filled out with Scripture passages, collects and prayers, ceremonies and other detailed material from one or another Lutheran use, or, very occasionally, from some other proper source. Thus, a rich body of approved liturgical material is provided for those who desire it. Permissive rubrics provide flexibility and make possible a simple, briefer service when this is desired. Essential material has a *shall* rubric; optional material is introduced by a *may* rubric.

Other significant features of the Book include the addition of the Festival of the Holy Innocents, Martyrs, to the Calendar, thus completing the historic cycle of three minor festivals in close proximity to the Feast of the Nativity; new Proper Prefaces for Advent and All Saints' Day; an alternate Absolution after the preparatory Confession of Sins; alternate Post-Communion prayers; permissive use of the historic and generally accepted word "catholic" instead of "Christian" in the Creeds; and a limited number of changes in the case of difficult or archaic ex-

pressions in the text of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures, which latter is retained as the normative text throughout.

Minor additions and refinements include proper Introits, Collects, etc., for several feasts in the Calendar; the lengthening of several brief Epistles; the appointment of a new Gospel for Trinity Sunday and of optional alternate Gospels for the First Sunday in Advent and the Ninth Sunday after Trinity. There also is a change in the order of parts after the Sermon, the Offering immediately following the Votum. This restores the historic association of the Offertory with the Prayer of the Church. Mention may also be made of the new Lectionary for Matins and Vespers, and of the use of the word "Alleluia" instead of "Hallelujah" in the text of the Graduals and throughout the Services.

These new features, taken together, distinguish the new Common Liturgy from other liturgies and mark it as a distinctive American Lutheran Use. They are not mere novelties, but rather, for the most part, restorations of historic forms and usages from different periods of the church's liturgical development. A few are of recent origin, as in the case of some of the new Collects and Prayers. The text of the Prayer of the Church also is new, though based upon sixteenth century thought forms. The provision for a second service on Easter Day and the Prefaces for Advent and All Saints' Day follow Anglican and Scotch Presbyterian precedents. The alternative Absolution, certain Introits and Collects, and the Gospel for Trinity Sunday are drawn from medieval sources. The text of the Kyrie, the structure and most of the text of the Eucharistic Prayer, the plan of an Old Testament Lesson before the Epistle, the Festival of the Holy Innocents, the word "catholic" in the Creeds, the alternative Post-Communions, and the new order of parts after the sermon are all restorations of features from the worship life of the church prior to the medieval centuries in which Roman corruptions and disfigurements developed. We welcome these features in our services today as contemporaries in time and place of origin of the Preface and the Sanctus in the Holy Communion, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Te Deum, the Collect for Grace, the Collect for Peace, and other

liturgical gems already imbedded in our own liturgy and in the rites of the Universal Church.

Basically, then, the Common Liturgy is a blend of the historic German, Scandinavian, and American Lutheran uses of the sixteenth and twentieth centuries with the additions of features which round out its final form and express its contemporary and ecumenical spirit. All variations in the text of the Common Service have been reconciled. All new features have been introduced by common agreement.

Prepared for the use of two-thirds of all the Lutherans in the United States and Canada, the Common Liturgy is a work of large proportions. It presents the full Lutheran Service with all its provisions for all who wish to use it. Those who desire a simpler service may use its principal parts in their order, omitting such items as sung introits, graduals, antiphons, responsories, etc., and passing over minor festivals in the Calendar without observance.

Similarly there is room for ample variety in the matter of architectural appointments, musical settings, ceremonial, etc. Some parishes may desire, and may have the resources to provide, full and ornate services. Others may desire or only be able to conduct services of much simpler character. Freedom and flexibility of this sort are a Lutheran birthright. Every service, however, whether elaborate or simple, sung or said, should be within the framework of the common Rite authorized by the Church. The simplest service should not omit essential or important parts or change their order. The most ornate structure should not incorporate extraneous or unauthorized texts within its structure. Under all circumstances and conditions the integrity of the Church's Rite should be respected and conserved.

In keeping with this conception of unity in essentials and variety in non-essentials, three complete musical settings are provided for the text of the Liturgy. These settings, as well as the rich variety of tunes in the Hymnal, represent our three great musical heritages from Latin Christianity, from continental Lutheran areas in Germany and Scandinavia, and from sources

within the English speaking world. Whichever setting is used, the constant endeavor should be to promote congregational participation in the highest possible degree.

Next to the Bible and the Catechism, the Common Liturgy and Hymnal will be the church's most valuable instrument of devotion and instruction. The new Book is more than an evidence of the church's maturity and solidarity in this, our land. Its use over wide areas will bring synods and congregations much nearer the ideal cherished by Henry Melchior Muhlenberg more than a century and a half ago: "One Church, One Book."

May our Lord, the Great Head of the Church, accept and bless this labor of love, to the edification of His people and the glory of His most Holy Name.

The Common Hymnal

E. E. RYDEN

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

THE IDEA of a common hymnal for the Lutheran Church in America probably had its genesis in November, 1934, when the American Lutheran Conference met for its second biennial convention in Des Moines, Iowa. Lutheran co-operative endeavor was one of the themes of the convention, and during the discussions one of the delegates raised the question of a uniform Lutheran liturgy. The possibility of a common book of worship was also mentioned. Out of this discussion came the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, that a committee consisting of one member from each constituent body be appointed by the Executive Committee for the purpose of studying the feasibility of a common liturgy for the Lutheran Church in America and that said committee be authorized and directed to contact other Lutheran bodies with a view to obtaining their co-operation in this endeavor.¹

The Committee on a Common Liturgy came into existence by appointment of the Executive Committee the following year, but there is no record that it ever contacted Lutheran groups outside the American Lutheran Conference. As it pursued its assignment through the succeeding years, however, it seems to have gradually arrived at the conviction that a common Lutheran liturgy should not be considered apart from the thought of a common Lutheran hymnal. In the summer of 1944 the Committee decided to submit a proposal for such a common book of worship to the seventh biennial convention of the Conference, to be held in

¹ *Official Minutes of the Second Biennial Convention of the American Lutheran Conference, Des Moines, Iowa, November 14-16, 1934, p. 19.*

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in November of that year. Its recommendation reads:

The Commission believes that plans should be laid and set in motion as soon as possible looking toward a joint Lutheran Hymnal and Liturgy. The work of revision now being carried on in various synods should not be a hindrance but rather an aid to the eventual publication of such a Hymnal and Liturgy. The Commission is not agreed as to whether this joint effort should be limited to the American Lutheran Conference or whether it should be extended to all Lutherans in America.²

The Preliminary Committee of the Conference, in considering this proposal, recommended "That the constituent bodies of the Conference be requested to give earnest consideration to the desirability of close co-operation in the preparation of new hymnals." Because of pressure of business, this resolution failed to receive consideration on the floor of the convention, but the recommendation of the Committee on a Common Liturgy was referred to the Executive Committee of the Conference "for their consideration and action."

But other Lutherans were also dreaming about the same idea. Like so many other important movements in the church, the thought of a common hymnal seems to have had its birth spontaneously in various Lutheran bodies. On October 12, 1938, the United Lutheran Church in America, meeting in biennial convention in Baltimore, Maryland, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Common Service Book Committee be authorized to appoint a special sub-committee to engage in special and hymnological studies in conjunction with similar committees of other Lutheran bodies, should any choose to co-operate, and that an invitation to do so be extended to them to join in such an undertaking, with the understanding that such studies and conferences are for the purpose of mutual assistance and study, and for the publication of helpful information, but not for the issuance of authoritative documents.³

2 *Convention Report of American Lutheran Conference, Seventh Biennial Convention, Milwaukee, Wis., November 15-17, 1944*, p. 50.

3 *Minutes of the Eleventh Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, Baltimore, Md., 1938*, p. 501.

There is no record, however, that such an invitation was ever extended by the Common Service Book Committee to committees of other Lutheran bodies.

Meanwhile, the Common Service Book Committee pursued its work of revising the U.L.C.A. hymnal; a similar committee of the Augustana Church had begun work in 1936 on a revision of the Augustana hymnal, and in 1942 the American Lutheran Church likewise appointed a committee to "make a study" of its hymnal with a view to "possible revision." At the 1944 biennial convention of the latter Church in Sandusky, Ohio, this resolution was adopted:

The Hymnal Revision Committee was commended for approaching other Lutheran bodies on the matter of hymnal study and revision.⁴

This was evidently a reference to some informal letters which had gone out from the A.L.C. hymnal committee to similar committees in other groups suggesting consultation and sharing of ideas, but not proposing a common hymnal.

The year 1944, however, was to prove decisive for the new idea. While the American Lutheran Church was meeting in Sandusky, delegates to the 14th biennial convention of the United Lutheran Church in Minneapolis, October 11-17, were listening to a preliminary report by the Common Service Book Committee on a proposed revision of the U.L.C.A. hymnal. When it became apparent that the convention was about to approve that revision and to authorize the Committee to proceed with its work on the basis of its report, Dr. O. F. Blackwelder moved the addition of the following words as an amendment: "And in so doing, to seek the fullest possible co-operation with other Lutheran bodies in the hope of producing as nearly as proves feasible, a common Lutheran hymnal in America."⁵

As far as is known, the U.L.C.A. leaders had no knowledge of developments within the American Lutheran Conference, and the

4 *Minutes of the Eighth Convention of the American Lutheran Church, Sandusky, Ohio, October 9-14, 1944*, p. 277.

5 *Minutes of the Fourteenth Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, Minn., 1944*, p. 436.

above action was taken quite independently of the proposal for a common hymnal and liturgy which was to be brought before the Conference less than a month later by its Committee on a Common Liturgy.

To add to the rising sentiment for a common book of worship, the Board of Directors of Augustana Book Concern, meeting in Rock Island, Illinois, on October 19, 1944, went definitely on record in favor of the proposal, and requested Dr. P. O. Bersell, then president of the National Lutheran Council, "to inaugurate and prosecute action for the acceptance, development and publication of a common church hymnal by the various Lutheran bodies as an agent in making more efficient the stewardship of church funds and the cultivation of closer unity among Lutherans." Dr. Franklin C. Fry, Dr. T. O. Burntvedt, Dr. Em. Poppen and Dr. A. Haapanen, in reply to a circular letter from Dr. Bersell, expressed themselves in favor of the idea. Dr. J. A. Aasgaard and the late Dr. N. C. Carlsen did not commit themselves, but promised to bring the matter to the attention of their respective Churches.

On February 17, 1945, Dr. Luther D. Reed, chairman of the Common Service Book Committee of the United Lutheran Church in America, and Dr. Harvey D. Hoover, secretary of that Committee, addressed a communication to all Lutheran bodies within the National Lutheran Council, calling attention to the October decision of the United Lutheran Church and inviting them to send representatives to a conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June 19, 20 and 21, 1945, "to canvass the possibility of a common hymnal for Lutherans in America." To this conference, which was held in the First Lutheran Church of Pittsburgh, came twelve persons, representing four general bodies, as follows:

American Lutheran Church—Prof. John O. Lang, the Rev. L. O. Burry, Mr. W. S. Nischwitz.

Augustana Lutheran Church—Dr. E. E. Ryden and Dr. C. A. Wendell.

Evangelical Lutheran Church—Dr. Selmer A. Berge.

United Lutheran Church—Dr. Luther D. Reed, Dr. Harvey D. Hoover, Dr. Edward T. Horn III, Dr. William R. Seaman, Dr. George R. Seltzer and Dr. Calvin P. Swank.

Those present sensed that it was an historic occasion in American Lutheranism. Dr. Reed, speaking of the many forces working for Lutheran unity, described the meeting as unique. Not even in Germany have Lutherans been able to agree on a common hymnal. He made no effort, however, to minimize the difficulties confronting the conference, since each group had its own loyalties. Thereupon he called upon Dr. Seaman to invoke the blessing of God on the undertaking. Dr. Reed was chosen chairman of the group, and the writer of this article became its secretary. In a prepared paper given on the opening day of the conference, Dr. Seltzer stressed the high standards that would be demanded of a common Lutheran hymnal. "We have the opportunity," he said, "of compiling a model hymnal which will raise our own standards and increase our good name among the Churches of this land." The writer of this article, in another prepared paper, expressed the highest hopes for the success of the venture, but suggested that, in the event insuperable difficulties were encountered, the committee might concentrate on reaching agreement on a common core of hymns as a nucleus for a future effort of a similar character, and that uniformity be sought particularly in translations and musical settings of the Lutheran hymn heritage.

Through an analysis and comparison of the respective hymnals of the four bodies presented by Dr. Horn, it immediately became apparent that a surprising measure of agreement already existed. Here are some of the facts which his investigation revealed:

153 hymns are common to all four hymnals.

138 additional hymns are common to three.

Thus, a total of 291 are to be found in at least three of the hymnals.

272 of the 291 occur in both the U.L.C. and Augustana hymnals.

261 of the 291 occur in the E.L.C. hymnal.

221 of the 291 occur in the A.L.C. hymnal.

320 of the U.L.C. hymns are also in the Augustana hymnal.

287 of the U.L.C. hymns are in the E.L.C. hymnal.

231 of the U.L.C. hymns are in the A.L.C. hymnal.

291 are common to Augustana and E.L.C. hymnals.

251 are common to Augustana and A.L.C. hymnals.

243 are common to A.L.C. and E.L.C. hymnals.

437 Augustana hymns appear once or oftener elsewhere.

413 U.L.C. hymns appear once or oftener elsewhere.

407 E.L.C. hymns appear once or oftener elsewhere.

351 A.L.C. hymns appear once or oftener elsewhere.

The group thereupon set to work to select hymns for the first half of the Church Year. Remarkable agreement was experienced. At the conclusion of the third day, the conference adopted a statement in which reference was made to the "spirit of cordiality and unanimity characterizing the whole meeting" and pointing out that each group, while setting forth the merits of its own peculiar hymn heritage, had evinced a "willingness to make concessions in order to achieve agreement." "While additional conferences will undoubtedly be necessary before it can be definitely determined whether a common hymnal is feasible," the statement concluded, "the progress achieved thus far would seem to warrant considerable optimism in regard to the proposed co-operative venture. In view of these facts, it is the sense of the joint committee that these conferences should be continued, with the end in view of determining at the earliest possible date whether or not the hope of a common Lutheran hymnal may be made a reality."

A second conference, lasting four days, was held in the Hotel Henry, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, September 25-28, 1945. At this meeting a fifth Church of the National Lutheran Council group, namely the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, was represented by the Rev. F. C. M. Hansen. Dr. Albert Jagnow had taken the place of Prof. John O. Lang as a representative of the American Lutheran Church. Hymns were studied for the remainder of the Church Year and also under the rubrics of The Word, Baptism, Holy Communion, Confirmation, The Church, The Ministry, and Missions.

Hotel Henry in Pittsburgh was also the scene of the third conference, beginning Monday, October 22, and concluding on Friday, October 26, 1945. This, in the light of subsequent developments, proved to be a history-making meeting. Friday morning had been set aside specifically for the purpose of considering an

overture from the Augustana Lutheran Church regarding a uniform Lutheran liturgy. An Augustana representative on that day brought to the attention of the conference two official resolutions in which his body had gone on record in favor of co-operation with similar liturgical commissions of other bodies looking toward the adoption of a common Lutheran service in which peculiarly cherished elements in the liturgies of the various groups might be preserved. After an animated discussion, the following resolution was adopted:

In response to the suggestion of the Augustana Synod urging a study of the question of a Common Lutheran Liturgy (See August, 1944, Minutes, p. 284; 1945 Minutes, p. 312) and in view of resolutions adopted by the United Lutheran Church in America and the American Lutheran Church evidencing a desire for closer co-operation between the various groups in hymnological studies and other related subjects (see U.L.C. 1938 Minutes, p. 501 and A.L.C. 1944, p. 277), the Conference on a Common Lutheran Hymnal recommends that the presidents of the various Lutheran bodies be asked to appoint representatives on a joint commission similar to this one, who shall consider such liturgical matters as may be presented to them in the hope of achieving common practice throughout the Church.

The chairman and the secretary were instructed to bring the resolution to the attention of the presidents of the various Lutheran bodies. The response to this proposal on the part of the presidents was uniformly gratifying, and on February 25, 1946, the first meeting of the new group was held in Chicago, Illinois. The Joint Commission on a Common Liturgy thus came into being, and since that time has worked independently on its assignment.

A fourth conference on the common hymnal was held in the Hotel Henry, Pittsburgh, December 10-13, 1945, at which time it was agreed that the proposed hymnal should have the following arrangement:

- I. The Church Year
- II. The Church
- III. The Christian Life
- IV. Hymns for Occasional Use

A fifth section with the title, *Spiritual Songs*, was also adopted, but subsequently eliminated. Selection of hymns under the various rubrics was continued, and a number of new hymns were added to the rubrics already studied.

The fifth conference, held in the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, beginning February 27 and concluding on March 1, 1946, proved decisive for the common hymnal. At this meeting the representatives of the United Lutheran Church, American Lutheran Church, Augustana Lutheran Church and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church reported that the reaction within their respective bodies to the proposed hymnal was overwhelmingly favorable. Dr. Selmer A. Berge, of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, on the other hand, stated that his Church was not altogether satisfied with the results achieved thus far and expressed the opinion that all that could be done at this time would be to agree on a common core of hymns and to permit each group to add whatever hymns it might desire from its own heritage. He said that the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church was willing to continue co-operation in the joint endeavor on this basis. A resolution was thereupon adopted expressing the hope that the Evangelical Lutheran Church would "continue to co-operate in this work" and "eventually unite in the attainment of a Common Hymnal for our Church in America."

The conference then voted that the committee henceforth be known as "The Joint Commission on a Common Hymnal."

Another important action was the adoption of a resolution to determine responsibility for the content of the common hymnal, thus safeguarding the work from unauthorized changes that might do violence to the collection. This resolution reads:

Whereas past experience has indicated the necessity of determining in advance of publication the responsibility for the content, editing and format of hymnals of a co-operative nature,

Resolved, that, while it is the intent of this Commission to seek advice and counsel of the publication houses of all the bodies concerned in the publication of the common Lutheran hymnal, it is the recommendation of this

Commission to the respective bodies (to wit, the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Lutheran Church in America) that the ultimate responsibility for the content, editing and format of the common Lutheran hymnal be vested in this Commission, and further, that no edition of this hymnal be published without the imprint of this Commission.

A report on the work of the Commission, prepared by the chairman, secretary, and Pastor Burry, was submitted to the participating bodies at their respective conventions in 1946. This report reviewed the history of the undertaking, set forth the guiding principles followed by the Commission in its work, and listed all the hymns adopted under their respective rubrics. The participating bodies were asked not only to give their sanction to the resolution mentioned above, but also "to approve this report in principle," and to instruct their respective representatives on the Commission, in consultation with the other members, "to complete the details, to make such minor adjustments as may be necessary to secure balance, to continue with the study of the musical settings, and to proceed with the publication of the completed work."

All of the participating bodies with the exception of the Evangelical Lutheran Church approved the report with all of its recommendations, and thus the common Lutheran hymnal passed from the realm of hope to reality.

Since that time the Commission has held four annual conferences, and another is scheduled for September, 1950. At the meeting held in Pittsburgh, November 20 and 21, 1946, the Suomi Synod was represented for the first time. Dr. Berge reported at this conference that the Evangelical Lutheran Church, although it had not acted formally on the report of the Commission, was deeply interested in the project and would continue to co-operate. A new representative of this Church, Dr. L. N. Field, was present.

November 19-21, 1947, found the Commission in session at the Drake Hotel, Chicago, where all subsequent meetings have been held. At this session the Lutheran Free Church was represented for the first time. Dr. T. O. Burntvedt, president of the Lutheran Free Church, who was one of the two representatives

from that body, stated that his Church, through its official board, had voted to co-operate in the project. When the Commission met again, December 28 and 29, 1948, the representatives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church reported that their body had voted in biennial convention to accept the common hymnal as the official hymnbook of that Church, but had requested its own Commission to add a supplement to include "such hymns and other material as do not find their way into the main body of the book." Dr. Burntvedt reported that his Church would ask for a similar privilege.

In view of these developments, the Commission adopted the following resolution as a statement of policy:

The Commission on a Common Hymnal, having received reports of favorable action on the project from representatives of all the co-operating Churches, expresses its thanks to God for His blessing upon this united effort towards a common devotional life among our people, and in gratitude resolves:

- 1) To reaffirm its faith in the ideal of one Common Hymnal, which, less than four years ago, seemed impossible of attainment, but which is now rapidly approaching realization.
- 2) That, should any co-operating Church or Churches find it absolutely necessary to supplement the material that will ultimately bear the imprint of this Commission (including the hymns and such indexes as the Commission has already authorized or may hereafter do so), they shall
 - a) Give due notice to the Commission that they deem such a supplement imperative;
 - b) Recognize that the Commission retains its right to review any and all material already approved or which may hereafter be approved for inclusion in the corpus of the Common Hymnal;
 - c) Maintain the integrity of the corpus of the Common Hymnal (as defined in 2 above), and in harmony with the resolutions of this Commission of March 1, 1946, approved by the conventions of the co-operating Churches at their respective meetings in 1946;
 - d) Attempt to keep such a supplement as small as possible, and recognize that the cost of such supplement shall be borne entirely by the Church or Churches desiring it;

- e) Place such supplement after the corpus of the Common Hymnal (and such indexes as may be part of it), and, while the pagination of such supplement may be consecutive with the Common Hymnal, it shall be separately indexed with such indexes as the supplementers shall deem necessary.
- 3) That, should the complete realization of the ideal of a Common Hymnal be impossible at this time, the use of a Common Hymnal shall remain the goal towards which all of the co-operating Churches shall bend their efforts, severally and in concert.

The membership of the Joint Commission on a Common Hymnal has changed considerably since the original meeting was held in June, 1945. Two of its most distinguished members have been lost through death. They are Dr. Paul Z. Strodach of the United Lutheran Church and Dr. Carl J. Sodergren of the Augustana Lutheran Church. Both of these scholars made an invaluable contribution to the work of the Commission, and their passing is deeply lamented by all. As presently constituted, the Joint Commission consists of the following representatives:

American Lutheran Church—The Rev. L. O. Burry, Dr. Albert Jagnow, the Rev. Hans Knauer and Dr. Lawrence S. Price.

Augustana Lutheran Church—Dr. E. E. Ryden, Dr. E. W. Olson and Dr. Clifford A. Nelson.

Evangelical Lutheran Church—Dr. Selmer A. Berge, Dr. Lawrence N. Field, Dr. H. A. Preus and the Rev. Gabriel Tweet.

Lutheran Free Church—Dr. T. O. Burntvedt and Prof. Leland B. Sateren.

United Evangelical Lutheran Church—The Rev. F. C. M. Hansen.

Suomi Synod—Dr. Alvar Rautalahti and the Rev. Raymond Wargelin.

United Lutheran Church—Dr. Luther D. Reed, Dr. Edward T. Horn III, Dr. Harvey D. Hoover, Dr. Ullrich Leupold, Dr. William R. Seaman and Dr. George R. Seltzer.

Much of the work on the common hymnal is done by sub-committees and through individual assignments. The Text Com-

mittee consists of Seltzer, Horn, Seaman, Burry, Price, Olson, Ryden, Berge and Hansen. The Music Committee is made up of Horn, Reed, Seltzer, Ryden, Nelson, Jagnow, Knauer, Field, Preus, Tweet and Hansen. The Rubrics Committee consists of Seaman, Horn and Seltzer. A Joint Editorial Committee to cooperate with a similar committee from the Joint Commission on a Common Liturgy has the following membership: Reed, Jagnow, Ryden, Seltzer, Seaman and Horn.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

At its very first conference, the Joint Commission on a Common Hymnal began to discuss basic principles in the selection of hymns. Although no set rules were ever established, the members of the Commission, as the work progressed, seemed to arrive at a common understanding relative to the requisites that should be met by every hymn adopted for the collection. Three of these were constantly kept in the foreground:

1. *It must be Scriptural in language or thought.*
2. *It must be devotional in character.*
3. *It must be lyrical in quality and exalted in poetic expression.*

Relative to the first requisite, there could scarcely be any disagreement in a Lutheran group. Although Lutherans would hardly subscribe to the Calvinistic theory that a hymn must be written in the exact language of Holy Writ, or at least a paraphrase, they would most certainly insist, on the other hand, that it must be faithful to the Word of God. In other words, they would tolerate nothing un-scriptural.

By the same token, the Commission was of one mind in the conviction that the above criterion should supersede Lutheran authorship in the choice of a hymn. Nowhere is the reality of the communion of the saints so apparent as in the hymnbooks of Christendom. Here we find how true believers of all ages and in every segment of the Church have given a united witness to their faith in Christ and their devotion to Him. A Christian book of worship must of necessity be ecumenical in character, reflecting continuity

with the true Church of Christ and the saints of God throughout the centuries. If it loses sight of this principle, it becomes sectarian in character. In this connection we are indebted to Dr. Seltzer for calling our attention to a dissertation by the late Dr. Henry E. Jacobs on the subject, "What Is a Real Lutheran Hymn?" Quoting the Formula of Concord, which states, "We accept the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, not because it was composed by our theologians, but because it has been derived from God's Word," Dr. Jacobs draws the conclusion, "We sing hymns, not because they have been composed by Lutheran authors, but because their doctrine is drawn from God's unerring Word."⁶ In following this principle, the Commission explored the whole field of Christian hymnody, beginning with the ancient Greek and Latin writers down to the present time, including the finest of English hymns of our own day, irrespective of authorship or communion.

The Commission likewise found no difficulty in agreeing on the second principle stated above. To be worthy of a place in the corporate worship of the Church, a hymn must move Godward and not manward. This would automatically rule out hymns of a purely subjective nature, as well as the more sentimental and emotional type usually classified as "Gospel Songs." On the other hand, since religion is a very personal thing, extreme care must be taken not to quench the desire of devout souls to give expression to the joy, hope, and love born within them through faith in Christ. Most of the Psalms in the Psalter are very personal, and Paul Gerhardt, "Prince of Lutheran Hymnists," certainly did not hesitate to make use of the pronouns "I" and "me." In each of these cases, however, universal rather than purely individual spiritual experiences are reflected and the movement is always Godward. What is true of the purely subjective and emotional hymn applies also to didactic or homiletical hymns. Since these are primarily addressed to ourselves or other worshippers rather than to God and therefore can hardly be regarded as true idioms of worship, they must be rejected in a church hymnal unless other extraordinary qualities seem to warrant their inclusion.

6 *Lutheran Church Review*, July, 1922, p. 218.

More difficult of application was the third principle, especially in such a group as the Joint Commission on a Common Hymnal. Coming out of several different nationalistic backgrounds, the representatives of the various bodies were understandingly zealous to preserve as much of their deeply cherished hymn heritage as they were able. The importance of the projected common hymnal was appreciated by all. Here, perhaps, was the greatest opportunity that would ever be afforded to introduce to the worship and cultural life of the whole Christian Church in America the spiritual treasures in song from Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland. Pressure from their respective groups also was exceedingly strong, for hymns have a marvelous way of invading the deepest recesses of the human soul and becoming a very part of a believer's spiritual life. What is often forgotten, or perhaps charitably ignored, is the fact that all of this heritage comes from foreign lands and alien languages, and that translations into English seldom reflect either the poetic beauty or exalted spiritual message contained in the original. Indeed, not infrequently a very wretched translation has been tolerated by a less discriminating generation by reason of the affection felt for the original or by virtue of a greatly cherished chorale with which it was associated. Only rarely have our great Lutheran hymns been clothed successfully in English dress. "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God" and "Now Thank We All Our God" are outstanding examples of translations that have become an integral part of our native literary tradition, but even the former is found in a number of different versions, indicating a degree of dissatisfaction with the results achieved.

The Commission, therefore, was undoubtedly fully justified in taking the position very early that all translated hymns, from whatever source, must be subjected to the most critical scrutiny from the standpoint of literary and poetical merit. It was not unmindful of the fact that this was not the first attempt to create an inter-synodical Lutheran hymnal in this country. During the twenties a similar work had come into existence through the efforts of a less critical commission. This group evidently had attempted to please all of the participating Lutheran bodies, with the result

that, in the end, none was pleased! Only the American Lutheran Church adopted the book as its official hymnal, and it has not proved very popular in that body. The present Commission, therefore, has sought consistently to limit translated hymns to the very choicest gems in each of the various nationalistic heritages. It believes that by such a policy of fine discrimination the common hymnal will be enriched from various Lutheran sources and that many of these hymns may eventually become a part of the spiritual treasury of the whole Christian Church in America.

The Commission has likewise sought to incorporate into the common hymnal the finest hymn tunes and chorales from Lutheran and other lands. Since music is a universal language and consequently presents no problems of translation to wrestle with, the task of transplanting European hymn tunes to American soil is a comparatively easy one. The Commission has been careful, however, not to do violence to tradition. Wherever words and music have become inseparably wedded through common usage, it has scrupulously refrained from making a change. On the other hand, it has suggested stronger and more worshipful tunes as alternative settings in a number of instances where the traditional tune seems weak, sentimental, or has not worn too well under the test of time. It is here that the Lutheran chorale reveals its intrinsic worth. While other tunes come and go, these musical classics from Germany and other Reformation lands retain their vigor and freshness through the passing of the centuries.

Here it might be mentioned that the Commission has applied a similar test in the choice of the hymns themselves. It has recognized that common usage is an important principle to observe in determining the value of a hymn. By careful scrutiny of the standard hymnals of our day, it has often been discovered that hymns that were popular a generation ago are gradually being discarded. On the other hand, it is sometimes found that older classics are meeting with renewed appreciation and are finding their way back into modern hymn collections. The hymns of Isaac Watts seem to belong to the latter category. Aside from Lutheran hymnals and those of the other principal Protestant communions in America,

the Commission has been guided largely in this matter of usage by such outstanding collections as *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, *The English Hymnal*, *the Church Hymnary* of Scotland, *The Hymnary* of the United Church of Canada, and *Songs of Praise*.

The problem of whether or not the common hymnal ought to include any of the so-called "Gospel Hymns" has vexed the Commission ever since it began its work. At first it was agreed that the new hymnal should contain a division known as "Spiritual Songs." This action was later rescinded, at which time it was decided that only the better hymns in this category should be retained, these to be distributed throughout the book. At the latest meeting of the Commission it was the consensus of opinion that a few hymns of the "American tradition" should be incorporated in the hymnal, including the best tunes of such early American composers as Thomas Hastings and Lowell Mason.

In classifying the hymns, the Commission has decided to place as many as possible under the general rubric, "The Christian Life." This, it is believed, will result in far greater use of many hymns that otherwise would probably be overlooked if placed under such special rubrics as "The Church Year," "The Church," or "Occasional." Adoption of devotional sub-divisions under "The Christian Life" instead of the traditional doctrinal classification will also undoubtedly make this part of the hymnal more appealing to the average worshipper. These sub-divisions are: Repentance and Faith, Aspiration, Adoration and Praise, Thanksgiving, The Inner Life, Contemplation, Consecration, Pilgrimage, Service, Conflict and Victory, Comfort and Rest.

Lutheran organists and choirs will be happy to learn of two decisions with reference to the music of the new hymnal: first, that as many stanzas of the text as is found practicable will be printed between the musical staves; and, second, that the rhythmical settings of the Lutheran chorales will be used in most instances. Musical versions of the chorales have varied greatly among the Lutheran Churches, both in Europe and America. The Scandinavian groups, for instance, sing most of the chorales in even time, whereas the rhythmical form is generally used in Ger-

many and in American Churches of German origin. The rhythmical settings are favored because they were originally thus written, and because they are brighter and more interesting. However, there are often several rhythmical versions of the same hymn, and some of them are not too singable. Here the Commission has been faced with the problem of making a choice, and it has adopted the principle that a rhythmical setting shall be used only when the rhythm flows naturally and can easily be sung by the average congregation. Thus it appears that even the confusion heretofore existing in regard to Lutheran chorales will find a solution in the common hymnal, and that American Lutherans of all varieties will eventually be able—we say it thankfully—to unite harmoniously in singing Martin Luther's "Ein' feste Burg"!

(A second part of this article, to appear later, will deal with the contents of the hymns selected for inclusion in the new Hymnal.)

“Treasures”

There are treasures of earth, in its hills and its vales,
 In the fields where the golden grain bends ;
But no treasures on earth
Can compare in their worth
 With the treasures we have in our friends.

There are treasures of mind, all so richly endowed
 With the gifts that our God has conferred ;
But no treasures of mind
Can compare in their kind
 With the treasures we have in His Word.

There are treasures of soul that inspire us and bless,
 That the saints through the ages have stored ;
But no treasures of soul
Can enrich or control
 As the treasures we have in the Lord.

VICTOR BECK

This poem is one in a collection entitled *Faith Has Eyes* being published this summer by the Augustana Book Concern for the author and is used here with his permission.

The Physician and the Minister

ERICH STEINTHAL

CHRIST once healed a man who had been paralyzed. He told him, "Arise and walk." And a little later, "Thy sins are forgiven." Nowadays it takes two, sometimes three men to perform the one-man job Christ did: the physician, the psychologist, the priest. Why? The answer will be found in the nature of Western man. Therefore, I would like to outline some of the thoughts a physician may have concerning the nature of man. An exchange of views on this subject seems to me essential for a successful co-operation between the minister and the physician for the benefit of the sick.

Let me begin with a statement. Man is an animal being; he is a social being; and he is a spiritual being. He is a trinity. As an animal being he examines himself with the help of natural sciences; his social existence he may analyze with the aid of psychology; his spiritual aspirations are clarified and guided by theology.

The natural sciences have during the last few hundred years influenced very much the life of modern man. They have clarified his situation as an animal being. They have instructed him in the mechanisms of the physical, chemical, and biological processes of his body. They have furnished him with tools and machines by which he has multiplied the efficiency of his organs. They have changed the world for him and created the new world of technical appliances. They have made him the most successful animal in creation. No wonder that modern man puts a great deal of faith in science, a fact that causes ministers many a problem with some parishioners. For modern man's faith in science sometimes takes precedence over his faith in God. His total outlook on life, his thinking, his actions, his emotions, his fears, his hopes, his ideals, are conditioned by science as the background of modern Western

civilization. Let me therefore try to analyze a few trends in the mind of modern man which seem to me conditioned by science.

Science is based on three principles: on observation; on scientific theory, on the experiment. These principles evolved gradually through the centuries.

Unlike the kingdom of God, science cometh with observation. Now since his Neanderthalian origin a hundred thousand years ago, man certainly did observe nature incessantly and intensively. How else would he have survived? But modern science came into being at an increasing speed during the last few hundred years only. The Middle Ages did not have any science as we have it today. In fact they did not want any science. The leading spirits of the Middle Ages were more interested in man and his soul and the relationship of man's soul to God. Saint Augustine once proclaimed this to be the entire concern and study of his life. This introspect attitude changed gradually. In two men a turn of the mind first became manifest, in a saint and in a poet. Around A.D. 1200, St. Francis of Assisi wrote his Canticle to the Sun. He calls the sun, the wind, the fire his brothers; the moon, the water, the earth his sisters. Never, even when deified in pagan religion, had the stars and the elements come so close to the human heart. Man took an entirely new, a passionate interest in nature. A little more than one hundred years after St. Francis, the Italian poet Petrarch climbed Mont Ventoux near Avignon in southern France solely to enjoy the beauty of the view from the mountain top. An unheard of, crazy thing to do in those days. But if you want to get a more immediate understanding of the feeling with which man now appreciated nature, then look at the paintings of the masters following the Middle Ages. Watch how the remote spirituality expressed in Byzantine icons recedes. The reflection of eternity disappears from the faces and gives way to the expression of human passions and emotions. The background of gold is replaced by a view of a landscape. Hieratic pose changes to natural gestures. The scenes do not any more seem to emanate from infinite space but are grouped in natural surroundings. The laws of perspective are sought and soon discovered and mastered. The artists

take infinite pains to draw men and women and children, nature and utensils made by man as naturally as possible. They even try to convey the sensation experienced by touch, the feeling of wood and marble, metal and silk, velvet and human flesh, the feeling of texture. They become interested in the dramatics of the interplay between color and light. Against the background of such passionate interest in nature and love of the outer world the beginning and the progress of modern science has to be viewed. At about the same time that Petrarch climbed Mont Ventoux, the physicians at the University of Bologna overcame innate inhibitions and began to dissect human corpses. With a new impetus man began to watch the movements of the stars and the planets with more and more precision. The microscope was invented and opened the door to a realm of nature before unknown. You are all familiar with the glorious story and pageant of the coming of age of modern science. I need not dwell on it. And man's interest in the world around him seems not to have lessened. He wants to see. He believes what he sees. And he has acquired a keen eye. No wonder that modern man has become quite an extrovert, especially here in this country where science and its nursling, modern technique, have achieved their greatest triumphs.

Observation alone does not constitute science. Scientific theory is needed to sift and integrate the observations and to plan the way to further investigation. To the modern scientist theories are tools. Nothing else. He has divested them of all metaphysical aspiration. He is ready to discard a theory or limit the field of its application if new observations seem to require it. We have all just experienced how the laws of classical mechanics were stripped of their dictatorship in the realm of science and were assigned to rule over a limited province, their place being taken by Plank's and Einstein's theories.

That is not the way the layman takes to scientific theories. He immediately tries to link them to metaphysics. And indeed when early Greek philosophers inquired for the first time in Western civilization into the nature of nature, their questions were prompted only partly by the observation of nature and a good deal

by metaphysical speculation. How far and in which way did scientific theory shape the mind of modern man? To the early Greeks nature had been a series of dramas enacted perpetually by innumerable divinities. It was Zeus who flashed lightning and made the heavens thunder. Apollo guided his sun chariot over the earth from dawn to dark. Poseidon struck the sea with his trident. The whims of nature were the unpredictable whims of innumerable major and lesser divinities. Man lived in constant fear of what the gods might be up to next. Man felt utterly insecure and he groped for security in an ever-changing world. Was there anything beyond change? Something solid the world was made of? Something not attributable to whim or chance? The early Greek philosophers gave various answers to these questions. Common to them all is their doubt of the reality of the world our senses show us. Common to them is also their belief in one ultimate, eternal, indestructible principle of the world. Some of them considered water or fire to be such an ultimate principle. Democritus first conceived the theory of the atom, and even if matter was discarded as the ultimate principle, Heraclitus proclaimed that the very fact of eternal change constitutes a principle strong enough on which to build the world.

The average modern man shares some of the ideas of the early Greek philosophers. He believes in matter even if he is not always able to grasp the modern concepts of the relationship of matter and energy. He believes in the mechanical explanation of nature. He believes in the law of cause and effect. He believes that there is a natural reason for everything. He is a rationalist. And he thinks other problems besides the problems concerned with nature can be solved by a rational method.

Observation and theory alone do not make for modern science. The methodical use of experiment is the cornerstone of modern science. No observation and no theory is accepted unless proved and checked and rechecked by the experimenter. The experiments of modern chemistry derive directly from the experiments of the alchemists who were looking for a substance which would change base metals into precious metals, and for an elixir to prolong

life. There is an old myth that alchemy was taught by fallen angels to the daughters of men whom they had married. All through the Middle Ages alchemy was surrounded by a demonic aura. I have only to remind you of the story of Doctor Faustus. This demonic nature of the experiment had been hidden in an age of enlightenment and rationalism till we suddenly were made aware of it by the explosion of the atom bomb. With the methodical application of the experiment man gained a terrific power of the forces of nature. No wonder that his lust for power increased manifold. He has become a powerful, rational, extrovert being.

Even if we do not join those who declare that mankind is a complete social failure and on the verge of destruction, we all will admit, I suppose, that man as a social being has been far less successful than in his dealings with nature. We have made progress in the control of epidemics and we have acquired some skill in the handling of organic disease, yet we seem increasingly unable to prevent war, and we see more and more people falling prey to nervous breakdowns and others presenting the signs of severe nervous tensions. The ultimate cause is always the same, social maladjustment. As ministers and physicians we cherish the idea that the improvement of social conditions all over the world should start with the improvement of the individual. This is the Jewish and the Christian concept. It is the concept of democracy. It is not the principle of totalitarianism. This world would be a better place to live in if more people would develop a mature mind, as Allen Henry Overstreet points out; or if we would become more fit to live with, as Harry Emerson Fosdick expresses it; or if more souls could be saved, as Monsignor Sheen emphasizes.

The success of man as a social being depends on the mastery of himself, not on any blueprint for a world state, be it under communistic or democratic rule. Man has to learn to master the tremendous explosive nuclear powers of his soul, as he has learned to make use of the menacing forces of nature. Such mastery must be based on self-knowledge.

Man has looked for self knowledge since time immemorial, but his endeavor remained on a mythological level, so to speak. If

you want to know what man thought of himself and how he looked at himself through the ages and under different cultural conditions, you have only to delve into the tales of mythology and the vision of the great poets. This mythological stage of human self-contemplation was necessary, just as a mythological stage had to precede the rationalistic stage of science. We have only now begun to enter the rationalistic stage in our dealing with the forces of the human soul. Sigmund Freud ushered in that era, and his importance may be compared to that of Copernicus in relation to the initiation of modern science.

Freud was a rationalist and a determinist of the first water. Let that not deter us. He had to be in order to find sense in seemingly irrational phenomena and to prove the strict necessity of actions which so far had always been considered actions of mere chance. Rationality was the tool with which he pried open the secret chambers of the human soul. I assume familiarity with the concept of modern psychology and psychoanalysis in a general way, and knowledge of the theories of Freud and Alfred Adler and Carl Gustav Jung. We have heard about Oedipus complex but we may not quite recollect the adventure Oedipus had with the sphinx.

At the gates of Thebes sat the sphinx, half woman, half beast on the rock of ages. Whoever approached her had a riddle presented to him. If he failed to solve it he died. The riddle ran: "What animal walks on four feet in the morning, on two at noon and on three in the evening?" Nobody had been able to solve it until Oedipus, after having killed his own father, faced the sphinx. The sphinx, demonic life, had placed before man the riddle of solving his own conscious identity. The identity of the most disparate parts of his soul, the impulsiveness of youth, the activity of mature age, the wisdom of declining years. Oedipus, the hero who was unaware of his own identity, solved the riddle of man. The sphinx hurled herself into the abyss and with her went eons of superstitions, of primitive magic and illogical thinking, of ages when man identified himself with plants and animals and chose them as his totem, when he lived in dreams and imagery, suffered

under far-fetched tabu laws, worshipped the split parts of his soul in idols, and brought human sacrifices. Man recognized himself, he awoke to consciousness, he became full of pride. "Man the measure of all things," proclaimed Protagoras, the sophist. "No greater marvel on earth than man," sings the chorus in Sophocles' "Antigone." The old myth has it that the sphinx perished in the abyss. Yet that was not so. She had been badly mauled but she managed to survive. She began to show her claws every once in a while and today more so than ever. Therefore, Oedipus' deed had to be remedied. Oedipus' solution of the riddle was only a temporary solution. Today man has become aware of his double nature, not to mention duplicity. The sphinx returns, she wants to be accepted and honored and soothed. She is powerful, her forces can spread misfortune or blessing. We have to humor her. The return of the sphinx,—that is the meaning of Freud's conception of the unconscious.

Not by chance did psychoanalysis come into being at the turn of the century, fascinating people far beyond medical and psychological circles. The time was ripe for it and it was needed. After the Middle Ages Western man had become more and more of an extrovert. Now a reaction set in. Again, I can refer to art to illustrate my point. The painters began to turn away from nature. Van Gogh still painted nature, but he transformed it with the flames of his burning soul. People looked once more at the icons of old and found more pleasure and satisfaction in them than in the Raphaels and Michelangelos. The drawings of children, the art of primitive tribes were admired. Finally the painters gave themselves up to the abstract, non-objective art, to the magic of surrealism, and to the drawing of an unreal, dreamlike world. Over-determination of extroversion mobilizes the archaic, primitive forces of the unconscious. The totalitarian states are an example. The totalitarian state absorbs the individual completely into an idea. It demands the complete sacrifice of the individual. The idea is everything, the individual nothing. It does something to the individual; it changes his set of values, his way of thinking completely. I, and probably you too, were puzzled by the trials in

Moscow of men who for years had been faithful members of their party. We were puzzled by their confession of guilt. We did not believe these confessions and considered them achieved by trickery. They were true confessions nevertheless. These men actually felt themselves guilty because their soul-searching showed them that they were not good communists. They reproached themselves that, not intentionally but unknowingly, they had not followed the party line. They had not rebelled; they had not tried to undermine communism. Theirs was not a crime of passion, but intellectual weakness in not knowing which way the party line was turning. This intellectual weakness showed them that they had not become one with communism, that they had not brought the whole sacrifice of their individuality, for they were not perfectly willing to pay the price. This kind of reasoning is very difficult for us to understand, because we have not achieved, thank God, the same degree of extroversion as these men. To us temptations come from without, from the world; to them, they come from within, from their own personality. Arnold J. Toynbee points out that in a disintegrating society archaisms and chiliastic visions come to the surface. The same holds true for an over-integrated society such as communism. As a reaction to extreme extroversion the forces of the unconscious erupt. There is a chiliastic vision of the millenium of world domination by the classless society of world communism. There is deification of human beings like Lenin and Stalin; there is return to the primitive stages of culture like slave labor; there is widespread manifestation of the sadistic and masochistic tendencies of an infantile age; there are human sacrifices. These primitive manifestations are necessary symptoms of any totalitarianism.

The task, the great task of modern psychology is to recognize the forces of the soul, not to let the sphinx run wild but to tame her and to turn her terrific powers to good purpose.

Will psychoanalysis then replace religion? To this I can only say: Psychoanalysis is, as the name says, analytic; it exposes, it is corrective, but it is not in itself creative. It can tell of what our soul is composed; it can give us an anatomy of the soul. It can

tell us what the forces of our soul can do and how they can be balanced. It explains to us the physiology of the soul. It may counsel us in the field of education, in the home and in the school, in our professional and social relationships. And it may help us in planning the social organization of society. Furthermore, it will do all this in a perfectly rational way. But I repeat: Psychoanalysis is not creative. It can only pave the way for creative action in the same way that medicine does by putting us in good shape physically.

With this, my authority as a physician and as a psychologist ends, but I feel compelled to say a few words about man as a spiritual being.

Man is an animal being, of necessity under the laws of nature. Man is a social being, of necessity under the laws of social integration. Man is a spiritual being, but not of necessity. The individual, created in the image of God, has the possibility of becoming a spiritual being, but many are called and few are chosen. As a spiritual being man faces God as Moses faced God on Mt. Sinai and in the burning bush. When man faces God, or the absolute, he ultimately faces God in solitude. That is his Gethsemane. In the Christian faith we emphasize and acknowledge this fact by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. Baptism signifies a rebirth, a rebirth from the animal world and the world of social affiliations into a spiritual world. Baptism secures to the infant the right to one day face God. The moment the child is able to go on his way toward God on his own responsibility, the rebirth is confirmed. Through rebirth man is put in a singular position. As an animal being the individual is less than creation; as a social being he is less than mankind; as a spiritual being he is less than God, but more than creation and more than the social organization to which he belongs. He determines his relationship both to creation and to society through his relationship to God, not the other way around—his relationship to God through this relationship to nature or society. Sören Kierkegaard calls this the paradox of faith. And Martin Luther expresses it too in a paradoxical way in his sermon about freedom of a Christian, "A Christian is master

over all things and at the same time a Christian is a servant to all things and subject to everyone."

Determination of one's relationship to God through nature leads to materialism and a more or less refined paganism. Determination of one's relationship to God through social organization leads to a more or less elaborate caesarism or totalitarianism.

Facing God is the condition for a creative life, the condition that by His grace God's power may become active through us. Now, spiritual life is very different from animal and social life. It comes not with observation, for the kingdom of God is within us. It comes with meditation. When Christ, during his baptism, faced God and became fully aware of his mission, he did not go out into the world immediately. He went into the wilderness for forty days and forty nights. He met with temptation from Satan himself. The spiritual way is beset with temptations, and the least of them are not the temptations of the flesh. It is the great and wonderful task of the minister to help the members of his congregation to face and to overcome the temptations that beset their spiritual path to God and from God on their return to the world. No psychoanalyst can relieve him of that task.

It is not by chance that, at the outset, I spoke of man as a trinity. It is not I who devised this conception; it is stamped upon the mind of Western man by the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. We believe in God the creator, and only because this faith has taken hold of the mind of Western man was he able to develop science. Because we believe in Christ, Western man by this faith has remained creative and Western culture has not died as other cultures have. We believe in the Holy Ghost and the communion of saints. Only because the Holy Ghost descended upon the disciples at Pentecost and made them utter one truth in all different languages, Europe became the guardian of Western civilization.

So, if I may close with an invocation, I would like to choose the words of the old Pentecostal hymn. In these troubled times of the troubled soul, "Veni creator spiritus!"

Historical Criticism, the Bible and the Word of God

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

THERE is no more vital and pressing problem confronting the Lutheran Church of America today than a clarification and a definition of the concept of the Word of God. The Lutheran conception stands over against the fundamentalist, the liberal, the Roman and the Anglican views, and must, therefore, be sharply differentiated from all of these. Our uncertainty as to the precise formulation of this doctrine renders our position insecure, both in reference to other tendencies and in our efforts to achieve unity within the Lutheran groups. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to formulate a statement which all Lutherans at present will accept. For this reason it is vitally important that the subject be discussed frankly and openly without prejudicing the participants in the discussion in regard to their fundamental Lutheranism. It is possible that by such discussions we will discover that our differences are not as serious as we think.

I. HISTORICAL CRITICISM

The problem of the Bible and the Word of God has been rendered acute by the appearance in modern times of historical criticism and scientific investigation. The various books of the Bible have become the object of scientific historical study which aims to discover the exact circumstances of origin, transmission, and authenticity. It is not possible in this day and age to ignore this historical criticism. Many of the theories and alleged results may be questioned, but no biblical theologian can refuse to face the issues involved. That most of the historical material in the Pentateuch and in the gospels existed at first in the form of oral tradi-

tion, and that the writers used older sources, are facts quite generally admitted.

The tacit assumption in some quarters that critical scholars have done their work in order to undermine and destroy the authority of the Bible is wholly unwarranted. In this field, as in every other field of inquiry, the object is to discover truth. The questions to which answers are sought are: where, when, how and why have these books which make up the canon come into being? The search for answers to these questions is a legitimate quest, and the right to pursue these studies cannot be denied by an appeal to the fathers or to the decisions of church councils. The only demand that can be made of the scholar is that he shall remain within his own province of historical investigation, and that he shall take all the factors into consideration. His goal must be to discover the truth as far as this can be ascertained from the objective data obtainable. After he has discovered this, he cannot honestly refrain from making it public. If he has found, according to his best judgment, that the Pastoral Epistles were not written by Paul, he must not pretend to believe otherwise. The Word of the Truth of the Gospel cannot possibly be enhanced by pretense, nor can it be destroyed by historical investigation.

It is, of course, true that historical criticism has raised doubts in respect to some of our traditional assumptions as to dates, authorship, and authenticity, and that the critics have emphasized, perhaps unduly, the problems, contradictions and inaccuracies which they have allegedly found in the Bible. The faith of many may have been shaken, or even destroyed, but in that case faith had from the beginning rested on an insecure foundation. The problem which faces us today is how to retain faith in the adequacy, integrity, and uniqueness of the Bible in the face of modern historical criticism.

II. SOME ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF THE BIBLE AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

The *fundamentalists* seek to solve the problem of the relation between the Bible and criticism by positing a perfect, inerrant,

and miraculous book, and denying the propriety, competency, and relevancy of historical investigation into its origin and contents. It is admitted that the Bible was written by men who have left the imprints of their skill and characteristics upon it, but it is not subject to human errors, mistakes and inaccuracies. In the course of transmission the text has become somewhat corrupt, and various discrepancies may now be found. But the claim is made that the original autographs were perfect and inerrant, and that the text of today is so close to the original that for all practical purposes it may be accepted.

This fundamentalist approach fails to present an adequate solution on two counts. In the first place, it necessitates a denial of the legitimacy and relevancy of historical criticism. Scientific investigation into the origin of the books of the Bible is labeled sacrilege. In the second place, it must be admitted that, if the claim of the fundamentalists is true, no accurate revelation exists today. The answer that our present text is admittedly close to the original and that the variations are not important is not sufficient. Since the autographs are not extant, how can anyone be certain or prove that the present text even approximates the original? The absolutism involved in the fundamentalist position is rendered meaningless by the admission that no absolutely authentic text exists.

The *liberal* theologians sought to solve the problem by accepting historical criticism and using it to discover and identify the original sources of the life of Jesus and the primitive faith. They assumed that Jesus had been an ethical teacher who taught a very simple gospel of faith in God, love toward men, and the infinite value of the human soul. In this ethical and social message they found "the essence of Christianity." The words of Jesus were the authentic Word of God. The church, and especially Paul, had corrupted this simple gospel by developing an elaborate theology, influenced by, if not totally borrowed from, the Hellenistic environment. It was the task of liberal theology to inaugurate a return to the simple gospel of the historical Jesus, which could be found by scaling off the later accretions of christology, soteriology, eccle-

siology, and eschatology. The result was a simplified and optimistic interpretation of Jesus and the New Testament, which had its chief basis in the evolutionary theory of infinite and inevitable progress. It was a romantic and optimistic faith, but it ignored a large part of the historical record and it emphasized the place of man and his achievements in the coming of the kingdom.

The liberal interpretation reached its height in the words of Holzmann and Harnack, but one of their students had already found the weakest point in the system and was preparing his attack. Albert Schweitzer discovered that this historical Jesus and his simple Galilean gospel were after all not historical. The picture of Jesus was too simple and too closely related to the ideal social reformer of the twentieth century. Schweitzer's reading of the gospels led to an entirely different result. Jesus was an apocalyptic visionary who believed that the catastrophic coming of the kingdom of God was immanent and that he was the instrument through whom it would come. When it failed to arrive as expected, Jesus determined to force the issue, to defy the powers that be in Jerusalem, and by his death to open the way for the inauguration of the kingdom. This apocalyptic Jesus had no interest in ethics and social reforms. The ethical elements in the gospels were supplied later when the church found it necessary to live in the world. Thus the one-sided liberal interpretation was replaced by an equally one-sided and distorted interpretation of the eschatological school. As the liberal theologians had used the historical method to distil the essence of Christianity out of the tradition, so the eschatological school used the same means to demolish the pleasant construction of the historical Jesus and his social gospel.

The real reaction to liberal Christianity is represented by *neo-orthodoxy*. The adherents of this tendency have taken historical criticism so seriously that they tend toward an avowed skepticism in regard to the Jesus of history and historical revelation. Bultmann declares that we can now know almost nothing about Jesus. "I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, and are, moreover, frag-

mentary and often legendary, and other sources about Jesus do not exist" (Bultmann, *Jesus*, p. 8). The gospels are productions of the church, and the incidents told are more relevant to the problems of the early community than to the earthly life of Jesus.

After having disposed of the Jesus of history the neo-orthodox turn to the Christ of faith and dogma. "In faith we are not concerned with the Jesus of history as historical science sees him, but with Jesus Christ of personal testimony, who is the real Christ" (Brunner, *The Mediator*, p. 159). The dogma of christology is quite independent of the Jesus of history. "To practice christology," says Tillich, "does not mean to turn backward to an unknown historical past or to exert oneself about the applicability of questionable mythological categories to an unknown historical personality" (*The Interpretation of History*, p. 265). In fact, according to Tillich it is possible "to practice christology" even if it should be proved that Jesus never lived (*Ibid.*, p. 33).

It is almost impossible to ascertain with any accuracy what neo-orthodoxy means by the Word of God. "The Word of God in the Scripture is as little to be identified with the words of Scripture as Christ according to the flesh is to be identified with Christ according to the Spirit. He who identifies the letters and the words of Scripture with the Word of God has never truly understood the Word of God" (Brunner, *The Theology of Crisis*). But Brunner also writes: "The Christian church stands and falls with the written New Testament, and the written apostolic testimony to Christ is not only the foundation of all the later witness of the church to Christ, it is also its norm" (*Revelation and Reason*, p. 127). And again: "Unlike the prophets (Jesus) is not a conveyor of a word, a message; he himself is the message. Words, therefore, are not of ultimate consequence, not even divine words, but the Word, which he himself, Jesus Christ, is" (*Divine Human Encounter*).

Since neo-orthodoxy is primarily a reaction to liberalism, it is compelled to emphasize what liberalism neglected and to deny its most cherished dogmas. Liberal theology emphasized the human character of Jesus, the Bible, the church and the kingdom. The

neo-orthodox reaction runs the risk of landing in a modern form of docetism. The incarnation is not real, the infinite cannot really unite with the finite. God is the wholly Other, he cannot be found here in the lowly form of a servant, in material elements, in a human book. The Bible as such is not the Word of God, it is only a sign (*Hinweis*) a witness (*Zeugniss*) to the Word. God is the infinite Majesty, the *Deus Absconditus*, who remains separated and aloof from his creatures. He speaks but his message and his words are not the words of prophet and evangelist. The neo-orthodox can, therefore, throw the historical record to the wolves of criticism while retaining a mystical and existential Word addressed to man *senkrecht von oben*. This Word is almost bereft of historical content, it is a bare demand for decision for or against God. The neo-orthodox speak with certainty and authority, but it is a paradoxical authority which seems to rest chiefly on the precarious human situation and the contingent character of man's existence.

A similar solution, but from an entirely different point of view, is presented by the *Anglo-Catholics* in England and America. Typical of this approach is an article by Percy L. Urban in the *Anglican Theological Review*, 1946, entitled, "Authority and Freedom in Doctrine." His topics are illuminating: Authority and the Gospel, Authority and the Church, Authority and the Ecumenical Scriptures, Authority and the Ecumenical Creeds, Authority and the Ecumenical Councils. "The sole source of authority is Jesus Christ. He is the Word of God, and he alone is final and infallible." The Church as the continuation of the incarnation partakes of this final authority, but it is not absolute, because it is derived and delegated. Scripture, Creeds and Councils were all produced within the church, and are consequently subject to the authority of the church. "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself is the Gospel, and it is pre-scriptural . . . God in Christ personally engaged in man's salvation is the gospel within the gospels, and before the gospels." The Scriptures are not infallible, but adequate for salvation. "But the Bible cannot be formative for

Faith, since Faith antedated it, and since it was Faith that inspired the New Testament, not the New Testament that inspired faith."

This sharp separation between the Gospel and the Scriptures removes the Bible as the authoritative basis of the church and of faith. It substitutes for it a mystical gospel which is arbitrarily lifted out from the Bible and which in the last analysis has no other authority back of it than the church itself. This gospel lacks the concreteness and the content which is necessary if the church is to proclaim it as God's message to the world.

III. THE BIBLE AND THE WORD OF GOD

All the schools of interpretation which have been discussed here attempt to define the Word of God in such a way as to leave room for historical criticism. In general the attempt is made to minimize the historical and to find the authentic word in some part of the Bible or over and beyond it. But the surrender of the objective word leaves the door open for subjectivism and mysticism. A true solution of the problem demands that the Bible be taken seriously as it stands and that the Word of God be sought, not *above*, but *in* the words which are here recorded.

The Bible is the record of God's redemptive activity and the continuation of that activity. Revelation is the result of this activity of God. The statement, "he made known his ways unto Moses, his doings unto the children of Israel," is preceded by the declaration that "the Lord executeth righteous acts, and judgments on all that are oppressed" (Psalm 103:6, 7). The Psalmist is thinking primarily of the Exodus and the journey to Canaan. By these acts and judgments God made himself known as the God of redemption and the covenant. The whole Bible is the story of this redemptive activity of God. The decisive point is the event of Christ, his incarnation, death and resurrection. By this event the evil powers have been defeated, the power of God revealed and the new age begun. This is the decisive deed of redemption, but God always has been, is now and ever will be active in the redemption of man. When Jesus speaks of the last day, he says: "When these things begin to come to pass,

look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh" (Luke 21:28). When God's work of redemption is finished, then also God's revelation is complete, for "we shall see him as he is."

The Bible is the message to us concerning this objective reality of the redemption of God in Christ. It is a message which changes the situation for every human being. Bishop Nygren of Lund has used an analogy in this connection which is very appropriate. In 1945 the message went out to the occupied countries of Europe: "Denmark is free. Norway is free." The stronger had conquered the strong man, had taken away his weapons and spoiled his goods. This message was an objective reality which changed the life situation for every inhabitant of these countries. The liberation was an objective fact. There might have been some who said, this cannot be true, it is a trick of the occupying powers. Those who said so would continue in the underground, and *for them* the event of liberation had no meaning. But this subjective unbelief could not nullify the reality of the objective liberation.

The Bible brings to us a message of an objective redemption. God has entered human life, he has engaged the evil powers which held man captive, and has won the victory. Jesus on the cross declared: "It is finished," and the triumph of the resurrection morn set the seal of God to this victory. This act of liberation changes the life situation of every human being. There is freedom, life, salvation for all. Man need not remain in the slavery of sin and death. He is free. But if he says, this cannot be true, no one can set me free, I must myself struggle against the evil powers, then he remains a slave and *for him* the act of liberation is without effect. But the objective reality of the redemptive deed of God in Christ remains.

This message comes to us in a human book, in human words, uttered by various persons in various times and circumstances. Since this book is human, it may contain inaccuracies, mistakes, and contradictions. Some of the books in the Bible may not be entirely the work of the author to whom they are attributed. The prophecy of Isaiah may be the combined work of two, or possibly three, men. Some of the events may be reported differently in dif-

ferent accounts. It is not quite certain in what way Judas died, nor does it matter much. The feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand may be two different accounts of the same event. Such features of the Bible are too well-known to need elaboration here.

We have no right to object to the form in which God's message comes to us. We must not tell God that he should have given us a different Bible, or pretend that he has done so. He should have made it grammatically perfect, historically accurate, and unmistakably divine. Such a demand is presumptuous. It is a part of the old docetic heresy which is unable to find God in the lowly, the weak and the human, and demands a clear, overwhelming and miraculous appearance of God. Christian faith has never yielded to the docetic view. It has found the divine in the lowly human form: the Lord Christ, true God and true man; the church, the Body of Christ and a human institution; the sacraments, the real presence and real bread and wine; the Bible, the Word of God and the words of men. It does not enhance the biblical authority to withdraw the Bible from historical criticism and invest it with a mystical air of inferrancy and perfection.

Since the Bible is a message about an objective redemptive act, the words in which this message is delivered are of tremendous importance. If anyone receives a letter, he must pay attention to the words if he is to understand the message. This applies also to the Bible. If anyone wants to know what this redemptive act is and means, he has to learn it by reading the words of the Bible. To say that "words are not of ultimate consequence, not even divine words," is to open the way for caprice and subjectivism. There are no other words which bring this message apart from the words of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. The reader must take these human words of the Bible as they stand, he has no right to amend or to change. How could anyone get the message of a letter if he decided to substitute his own words for those which the writer used?

The reader must try to understand these words just as they are. When Paul says about Abraham that "his faith was counted for righteousness," every word must be carefully studied. The use of these words in the Hebrew, the Septuagint, the New Testament,

and in profane Greek must be taken into account. The reader must also consider what other Christians have found in these words. If these words are a part of the message of God to men, *the meaning of these words* must be sought diligently. As the reader encounters the words of the Bible, he must not try to alter them or to remove what to him may appear contradictory and objectionable. The text as it stands, with all the traces of human imperfection, is the Word of God and the message of God.

This insistence on the importance of the words of Scripture need not lead to literalism and slavery to the letter. The words are the means, the vehicles, through which the message is given. The whole Bible speaks with one voice of the activity of God in creation and redemption. The message is unfolded from Genesis to Revelation in ever clearer and more majestic form. This record, in the words of prophets, evangelists and apostles, is the voice of God speaking to men in every generation. What God wants us to know about himself, his love and his redemptive activity is conveyed to us in the words of Scripture. The occasional obscurities, inaccuracies and contradictions, these evidences of the human medium through which God speaks, have no effect on this message. Their very presence in the record is a testimony to the fact that God actually enters human life on man's level and under the conditions in which he exists.

There is an unavoidable dialectic imbedded in the record of Scripture, which is a necessary part of man's relation to God. Man must start with the words of Scripture, for there is where God meets him. These words must be taken seriously as they stand. He who would know the will and purpose of God must ask humbly and insistently: *What is written?* But as he learns what is written and what the message of God is, he returns to the words and finds them illumined and clarified in the light of the revelation of God's eternal purpose. He comes to the conviction that this Bible, just as it is, is the sole guide to faith and life. Luther could appeal freely to the words of Scripture and insist that the very words must be decisive in any controversy; but he could also declare that Christ is the center of Scripture and the Lord of the Bible. He was thus

able to appeal to Christ even against those who quoted Scripture as authority. When the Bible is understood as a message of the redemptive activity of God, it involves both an emphasis on the very words of Scripture and a freedom to judge every Scripture (and every interpretation thereof) in the light of this eternal purpose of God.

Reverent and scholarly historical criticism may then be applied honestly and fearlessly to the Bible. Such historical investigation, if its object is the search for truth, can help us to find how God has caused this message of redemption to be promulgated, transmitted, and proclaimed in the world. It can also help us to understand more clearly the thought-forms and conceptions in which this message was originally proclaimed, and thus help the believer to express the same message more clearly and convincingly to his own generation. But in determining what this message is and what it means the final appeal rests with the assertion: *It is written.*

The Theology of the "Common Confession"

EDWARD C. FENDT

THE TERM "Common Confession" is rapidly taking its place among older and more familiar designations, such as "Brief Statement," "Doctrinal Declaration," and "Doctrinal Affirmation" in the negotiations between the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church. All of these names refer to attempts to put into writing what is "publica doctrina" in either the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod or the American Lutheran Church. The "Brief Statement" was the product of the Missouri Synod. The "Doctrinal Declaration" is the property of the American Lutheran Church. The "Doctrinal Affirmation" is a compilation or combination of these two independent documents into one document. The "Affirmation" remained a report of committees. Neither church body adopted it as a satisfactory statement of its faith or as a sufficient basis for altar and pulpit fellowship.

The "Common Confession" has an interesting origin and purpose. Instead of combining or harmonizing two documents already in existence, the "Confession" is a new document. Representatives of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in negotiation with the American Lutheran Church were "instructed to make every effort to arrive ultimately at one document which is Scriptural, clear, concise and unequivocal" (1947). Representatives of the American Lutheran Church were asked to prepare a statement of common faith in modern, terse, and clear language in fulfillment of a resolution "to continue a Committee on Fellowship . . . to negotiate with a Committee on Doctrinal Unity of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod toward the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship or of fellowship commensurate with the existing degree of unity" (1948). Thus two committees were instructed to

work together in the production of a common statement of doctrine. The underlying motivation was to give expression to existing doctrinal unity rather than to rehearse past doctrinal disagreements or to seek compromises or conversions among the negotiators. The informed and fair-minded in each church body were convinced that sufficient doctrinal unity existed for representatives of both groups to meet together and draft such a document. Some in both groups, opposing any rapprochement between the groups that had held doctrinal discussions for over sixty years without attaining uniformity in doctrinal expression, remained dubious about this attempt. A few have voiced opposition to the procedure before and after the publication of the "Common Confession."

The "Common Confession" did not come as a surprise to most of the members of the negotiating synods. It was received as something to be expected, studied, evaluated and appreciated. While one discerning critic from a non-participating synod, not too friendly to the entire procedure, rather regretfully observed that the "Common Confession" *buries* the old doctrinal differences, another analyst, also from a non-participating synod, sees in this document a significant advance in the whole program of Lutheran unity in America. How the members of the participating synods have received or in convention will react to the document, or what use they will make of it, can be known only after the 1950 conventions of these synods.

It will be interesting to study developments. If the desire to establish official fellowship is strong enough to decide the issue solely on the basis of doctrinal unity, such a basis now exists. Prior to 1950 it was largely a matter of interpreting one's own doctrinal position to the other, or accepting the other's statement in the light of one's own declaration, or acknowledging one another's formulations as correct. The "Common Confession" introduces itself for study and evaluation as the statement of doctrine current in *both* synods. Neither synod can deny that the "Common Confession" states the doctrine it teaches. The "Common Confession" does state the doctrine taught by both synods. One or both of the synods may reject the "Common Confession" as a basis for

future fellowship, but neither synod is likely to disavow what is true about its "*publica doctrina*."

The members of the sub-committee who were asked to prepare the original draft of the "Common Confession" reported consensus on all doctrines. The membership of the two official committees reported no further disagreements and unanimously approved the text of the "Common Confession" for submission to the synods for adoption. There was no thought of hiding possible differences. There was no attempt at ambiguity so that diverging opinions could be officially approved or later discovered. There was no intimation of getting the other side to recant. The meetings from beginning to end were characterized by an interchange of honest conviction and appraisal. The "Common Confession" is the work not only of official representatives of the participating synods, but of representative men of both synods. The charge can never be made that the "Common Confession" represents the thinking of only smaller groups. In every instance it represents the thinking of the representatives of both groups.

The "Common Confession" does not require an official interpreter. It is clean and unambiguous so that every intelligent Christian can understand it. But there are several facts which the theologians will not fail to observe. Some students of dogma may even wonder why certain doctrines are formulated as they are in the "Common Confession" and why some doctrines are found in their respective places in the general outline.

I

The "Common Confession" is intended as a confession of faith. It is not intended merely as a presentation in simple English of doctrines taught by the pastors of the participating synods, but as a statement of Christian faith, as held and received by the entire membership of the two synods. Laymen can claim this as their confession of faith as well as pastors.

It is not a theological treatise going into the minutiae of doctrinal elaboration or development. In later years it may need fur-

ther elaboration or development, but at present it aims to state concisely what the membership of both synods believe and teach.

This may help to explain why the first article deals with God and the last article deals with the "Last Things." It is the order of the Creeds and the Augsburg Confession.

The aim is not to say something new, but to state the old faith in modern language. The aim of the "Common Confession" is not divisive, but unitive. It was not written with a view of showing how different the participating synods are from other Lutherans in the world, either in past or present generations, but to set forth the Lutheran conception of the Christian faith as held and received by them. It is not something to be guarded by them exclusively, but something which they share with other Lutherans as the honest statement of their faith. It is not intended as a polemic that seeks to win more friends and alienate some enemies among Lutherans. It is not intended to be used as ammunition in the battle for leadership in the present drama of Lutheran unification in America. It is a simple confession of faith in God, in God's way of salvation, in God's Church, and in God's promises of the future life.

It therefore avoids glorifying synodical tradition or human leadership, both of which could have been mentioned in this document. It seeks to glorify God and points to His Word as the source and norm of what is believed and taught. Instead of endorsing a synodical bid for unification and merger or even mentioning a goal such as altar and pulpit fellowship between synods, the entire "Common Confession" rises above these mundane considerations and testifies to the eternal verities of God's revelation and activity. Instead of concerning itself with consideration of the present-day proposals for Lutheran unification in America, or offering a new scheme to realign Lutherans with or against each other, it passes these things by to testify of more important things.

There is no mention of furthering the organization of the synods, no speculation on what they may achieve if they reorganize or merge, no threats to others if they refuse to follow or agree. The emphasis throughout remains on *Solus Christus*, *Sola Gratia*, *Sola Fide*, and *Sola Scriptura*.

The "Common Confession" concerns itself with the message of the Church, rather than reorganization or realignment of the churches or synods. If anyone reads something into the "Common Confession" that is not there, he is doing so on his own responsibility. As far as this writer knows, there is not in either group desire for or expectation of merger of the two participating synods. The "Common Confession" is not intended as a doctrinal basis for merger of the synods, but it is a common confession of faith, a declaration of mutual conviction and testimony regarding the things that really matter in the Kingdom of God.

II

The "Common Confession" purposes to be a faithful statement of the Scriptural doctrines of salvation. Every doctrinal formulation is only a summary and correlation of the plain teachings of Holy Scripture.

Instead of citing Scripture by chapter and verse within or at the end of sentences, the references are listed at the end of the paragraphs. And often these references are to entire chapters, so that the doctrines may be studied in their Scriptural context. The committee did not have to search for more Scriptural references, but faced the task of selecting from the abounding references those which seemed most pertinent and conclusive.

The strength of the "Common Confession" lies in this area of faithfulness to the Scriptures. Any Lutheran document must be judged according to its faithfulness to "the only source and norm of Christian faith and life." The Lutheran Church does not have any other standard by which dogma is judged correct or false than the Scriptures. If theologians, pastors, or laymen can find in this "Common Confession" an unwarranted or incorrect statement of doctrine, the document should be revised or expurgated. One desire dominates the theological mind in both synods: to be unqualifiedly faithful to the Scriptural witness of God's salvation from sin. It is on this basis that past extravagances or unfortunate expressions have been deliberately omitted (or some even disavowed) and the "Confession" goes no farther than God's own

revelation in Holy Scripture in presenting the matter. The doctrinal formulation in the "Confession" aims to present Scriptural doctrine fully and completely, but in no case does it seek to go beyond the Scriptures and answer questions which are not answered in the Scriptures.

This may to some seem to be a defect in the "Confession." Some will be disappointed not to have their personal conclusions or theories upheld or corroborated by the "Confession," and these men are not entirely in one or the other of the participating synods. Others will protest that certain "heresies" are not plainly rejected. The committees evidently concluded that it was sufficient to rely on the truth as taught in the Scriptures, to state it boldly and forthrightly without adducing damnatory clauses to belabor an errorist if such an one should be discovered. The committees wrote a "Common Confession" of the Christian faith as held and taught within their synods by the rank and file of their pastors and believed and practiced by their entire membership. To question such omissions may indicate a psychological rather than theological attitude and may call for psychiatric analysis rather than theological reflection.

To insist that a "Confession" of faith go beyond Scriptural revelation is as dangerous as to insist on omission of pertinent Scriptural revelation. In either case it represents an attitude of personal prejudice that refuses to be bound by the confines God set for the Church and its theologians. God not only obligates the Church to go the whole way in faithfulness to the entire Scriptural witness, but also obligates the Church to stop where He stops in the proclamation of His way of salvation.

Many examples of this could be cited from the literature of past generations in both synods. The controversial expressions *intuitu fidei* and *predestinatio ad fidem*, so well known in former decades to all the members of these synods, are not perpetuated in this "Confession." The users of the *intuitus* were charged with making the faith of the believer a cause for salvation, whereas all believed with their whole heart that the grace of God in Christ was the sole cause for the salvation of the sinner. The users of *predestinatio ad fidem* were charged with making God the cause or

reason for the damnation of the unbeliever (they might better have been charged with making faith the real cause of salvation by having God decide whom He would save and then giving faith only to such persons, and thus having in these believers a reason to justify His salvation of them), whereas all were agreed that the sole cause for damnation was the sinner's rejection of God's grace in Christ. In the "Common Confession" the dogma of predestination is not omitted, but it is a faithful restatement of Scriptural doctrine, which does not seek to go beyond the Scriptures or tone down the Scriptural emphasis.

The careful student will find little cause to say "Missouri has abdicated" or "The American Lutheran Church has receded from its former doctrinal position." Each synod is equally anxious and desirous to let God's revelation in the Holy Scriptures be the deciding factor in all doctrinal matters. To seek to determine the rightness or wrongness of former contestants in doctrinal controversy was not the task of the committees, nor is that the task of the synods today. The great task remains to let God speak and for all to serve as faithful witnesses to His revelation in the Holy Scriptures. Any intelligent Christian can judge as to the truth or falsity of any dogmatic assertion on the part of churchmen, if he knows what God Himself reveals in the Scriptures. To believe less than that would belie the Lutheran understanding of the universal priesthood of believers and would certainly be a step in the direction of the Roman error which the Reformers in the sixteenth century sought to eradicate. Even synodical tradition and renowned theological leaders must appear before the scrutinizing eye of later generations, and priority must be given to God's own revelation rather than to theological formulation that falls short of or beclouds the clear Scriptural teaching.

Whether the "Common Confession," by giving full sway to the Scriptural presentation, can "unite" all the members of the two synods in one statement of faith regarding these doctrines remains to be seen. The one consideration that should begin, motivate, and end every discussion of the "Common Confession" should be to test it, whether it truly sets forth the Scriptural doctrine.

Every other consideration is subsidiary to this chief consideration. The church historian will not fail to warn that at no time in the history of Christendom has this been the case, and there is every likelihood that it will not be the case now. Such a consideration represents an ideal, which sinful Lutherans cannot fully incorporate into their thinking and voting. In recent publications, both in books and periodicals, there is a growing tendency to let philosophical and nationalistic principles determine theological formulation in various sectors of the Lutheran Church in the world. Will the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church be able to maintain their common understanding of dogma in this changing world? Are they correct in their application of an unqualified allegiance to the *Sola Scriptura*? Is there error in their presentation of Christian truth? The members of other Lutheran churches owe it to the two participating synods to point out where the "Common Confession" is in error. Or are there serious omissions? Let all Lutherans judge the "Common Confession" in the light of the Scriptural norm and bring forth their findings. The writer of this article believes such comments are welcomed by the participating synods. The comments of friends without may be more helpful than the criticisms of enemies within the two synods.

III

The "Common Confession" will not destroy or postpone Lutheran unity. It reemphasizes where the strength of the Lutheran church is to be found, viz., in its understanding of the Gospel.

For this testimony of the Gospel the entire Christian world should be grateful. There is much confusion in Christendom as to the nature and content of the Gospel. There is remarkable agreement among Lutherans throughout the world on the Gospel. Is Luther's *Smaller Catechism* responsible for this? Or is the Holy Spirit to be credited with something here, for which synods and theologians often claim credit? If the Holy Spirit is responsible, He leads Christians to give utterance to the faith that is in them.

It is a thoughtless clamor that insists that Lutherans should not write more documents that deal with Christian doctrine. That

is equivalent to saying that preachers should no longer preach or that Christians should no longer testify. Lutherans are perhaps in a better position than members of any other church in Christendom to express their conviction in a modern confession of faith. It savors more of American activism than of an evangelical mind to brush aside doctrinal statements and submerge the real issues confronting Christendom by forming agencies for co-operation and pressure politics in a household that represents a Babel of opinions and desires. It is only by the willingness to let God have His way in the Church that the Church can be instrumental in building His Kingdom and for the Church this must remain the crucial decision.

Agreement in doctrine is certainly basic to fellowship in the Church. Where two are not agreed on doctrine, they cannot claim complete fellowship with each other. To act as though these disagreements did not exist, or to overlook and disregard these differences, and yet enter into full and complete fellowship with each other would present a situation that savors more of deception than of truth. And it is in the area of understanding the Gospel and administration of the means of grace that complete agreement in doctrine is not only desirable but absolutely necessary. When two church groups find themselves in agreement on these matters, an experience that certainly is not without the Holy Spirit's activity, should they be counselled to keep silent or to testify of their common faith?

Over against suggestions that have been made to effect unification of Lutherans without doctrinal discussion or agreement, these participating synods still hold that it is important that there be an expression of the God-given unity, the oneness of faith, in a confession of faith, into which the Holy Spirit has led them. They think of this confession as a contribution, not a hindrance, to Lutheran unity. It was not conceived to create disunity. It was prayerfully executed to be a step toward Lutheran unity in America and the world.

The "Common Confession" is here appended.

Report of the Committee on Doctrinal Unity of the Lutheran
Church-Missouri Synod and of the Committee on
Fellowship of the American Lutheran Church,
December 6, 1949

In order to give expression to our common Christian faith, we hereby declare the following to be our mutual conviction and testimony:

I. GOD

We believe and teach:

The one and only God is the God Who has revealed Himself to us as the Creator of the world and its Preserver, to Whom the entire creation and all creatures are subject, Who is Lord and Ruler over all things. Through the Holy Scriptures He has revealed Himself to us as the Righteous and Holy One, and also as the God of our salvation from sin and death. He has designated and manifested Himself as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the work of creation, redemption, and sanctification. We therefore confess our faith in this triune God, three distinct Persons in the one Godhead.

All men can know of the existence and activity of God, deriving such knowledge from the creation of the world, their own conscience, and history. But who God is, how He is minded toward man, and what He has done for man's salvation from sin, can be known only from God's revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ through the Holy Scriptures. In Jesus Christ, God became incarnate. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John 1:14.

Cf. Acts 14:15-17; 17:24-31; Romans 1:19-20; 2:14-15; I Cor. 2:10-14; Eph. 2; Col. 1; II Tim. 3:14-17; Heb. 1-2.

II. MAN

We believe and teach:

God in the beginning created man in His own image to live according to His law which God had written into man's heart; but man disobeyed God and thereby became a sinner, alienating himself from God, and bringing sin and death upon himself and all his posterity. "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," Romans 5:12. Therefore all men are born into this world with original sin; and being unable to observe God's divine commands, they wilfully continue to transgress God's holy law in thoughts, words, and deeds. Man as sinner has delivered himself unto the bondage of sin and of the devil, from

which man cannot free himself by his own powers. From this desperate condition and tyranny only God can set man free.

Cf. Genesis 1-3; Psalm 51 and 130; Romans 1-7; Eph. 4:24; Heb. 2:14-18.

III. REDEMPTION

We believe and teach:

God from eternity decreed to send, and in the fulness of time did send, His Son to fallen man as Savior, to fulfill the law in the sinner's stead and to suffer the sinner's punishment in his stead. Christ "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," Romans 4:25. God "laid on Him the iniquity of us all," Isaiah 53:6. Christ entered into death in order to bring man, held in the grip of death, unto life with Himself. In His victory over death He brings to man a life of freedom from death. God by raising Christ from the dead proclaimed to the world that He has accepted the atonement for man's sin as completed, and that Christ, the risen and exalted God-Man, shall reign as Lord forever.

Cf. Isaiah 53; Matt. 20:28; Luke 24; John 11 and 14; Acts 2:22-36; I Cor. 15; II Cor. 5:14-21; I Tim. 2:4-6; I Peter 1:18-25.

IV. ELECTION

We believe and teach:

God from eternity, solely because of His grace in Christ and without any cause whatever in man, elected as His own all those whom He makes and keeps members of His kingdom and heirs of eternal life. The Holy Spirit by the Gospel has called us and assured us of our status before God, testifying to us that He has chosen us for Himself in Christ from the foundation of the world, and by the imputation of Christ's righteousness has given us the assurance that He will present us faultless before the throne of His glory.

Cf. Acts 13:48; Romans 8; Eph. 1; I Peter 1:1-9.

V. MEANS OF GRACE

We believe and teach:

God has willed that the knowledge and benefit of Christ's redemption from sin be brought to man through His means of grace, namely through the Gospel in the Word and in the Sacraments. Through these means He not only offers but actually bestows His grace in Christ unto forgiveness of sins and a life of fellowship with Him.

The Word. Through the Holy Scriptures, which God caused to be written by men chosen and inspired by Him, God instructs and assures us regarding His will for us. The Holy Scriptures constitute His Word to men, centering

in the revelation of Himself in the person and work of Jesus Christ for our salvation. Through the Holy Scriptures God continues to speak to men in all ages until the end of time. He speaks as the infallible and unchanging God, Whose message to mankind never changes. Since the Holy Spirit by divine inspiration supplied to the holy writers content and fitting word, therefore we acknowledge the Holy Scriptures in their entirety as the inspired Word of God. His Holy Spirit testifies in our hearts that His Word is true, that He will keep all His promises to us, and that our faith in Him is not in vain.

We therefore recognize the Holy Scriptures as God's inerrant Word, and this Word of God alone shall establish articles of faith (cf. Smalcald Articles, Part II, Art. II). We pledge ourselves to teach all things taught in the Holy Scriptures, and nothing but that which is taught us by God in the Holy Scriptures.

The Holy Scriptures teach both Law and Gospel, but the chief content of the Holy Scriptures is the Gospel. The Law enters into the service of the Gospel by bringing man to a knowledge of his sins, and by convincing him that he is under God's judgment because of his sins, and by telling the believer what fruits of faith he should produce.

Baptism. In the Sacrament of Baptism God adopts men as His children. In Baptism God confers the benefits of Christ's redemption and graciously bestows the washing of regeneration and newness of life. We recognize it as the Lord's will that men should be baptized even in their infancy, knowing that the promise of God also applies to little children.

The Lord's Supper. In the Sacrament of the Altar Christ gives us His body offered up for us, and His blood shed for us, to eat and to drink for the forgiveness of sins, the strengthening of our faith, and the increase in holiness of life. In this Sacrament we receive Christ's body and blood orally as well as spiritually. All communicants receive Christ's precious body and blood together with the bread and wine, but only the believers obtain the blessings of the Sacrament. Christ is not only present at the celebration of the Sacrament, but in this Sacrament He enters into the most intimate communion with the members of His Church, bringing to them His body and His blood by which He made atonement for their sins.

Cf. The Word: I Cor. 1-2; II Tim. 3:14-4:5; I Peter 1; II Peter 1:12-21.

Baptism: Matt. 28:18-20; John 3:1-13; Acts 2:37-39; Romans 6; Titus 3:4-7.

Lord's Supper: Matt. 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19-20; I Cor. 10:16-17; 11:23-29.

VI. JUSTIFICATION

We believe and teach:

By His redemptive work Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; hence, forgiveness of sin has been secured and provided for all

men. (This is often spoken of as objective justification.) "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation," II Cor. 5:19. Hence no sinner need be eternally lost on account of his sins. God offers this propitiation and reconciliation freely to all men through His means of grace. There is nothing in sinful man or in what he may do to merit God's declaring him righteous. God justifies the sinner solely on the basis of Christ's righteousness, which He imputes to the sinner through the Gospel and which the sinner accepts by faith. Such faith is wrought in man by the Holy Spirit. Through this faith we not only receive from God but also retain the blessed assurance of our righteousness in His sight for Christ's sake.

Cf. Romans 3-5; 8; Gal. 2:16-3:29; Col. 1; I John 2:2.

VII. CONVERSION

We believe and teach:

The sinner's conversion takes place when God brings the contrite sinner to faith in Christ as his Savior. This change of heart with respect to sin and this reliance upon Christ for salvation from sin is the work of God the Holy Spirit, without any co-operation whatsoever from sinful man. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost," I Cor. 12:3b.

Cf. Acts 5:31; 26:18; Eph. 2:1-9; Jer. 31:18-19; Ezek. 11:19-20.

VIII. SANCTIFICATION

We believe and teach:

The believer in Christ can no longer enjoy living in sin, but he is prompted and enabled by the love of God in Christ and by the indwelling Holy Spirit to live according to God's commandments and to be minded towards all things as God is minded. "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me," Gal. 2:20.

We therefore, out of gratitude to God, seek to glorify Him by abounding in good works, without which faith is dead. In glorifying God we seek to serve Him and our neighbor in love, as He directs us in both tables of His Law.

In this present world the Christian can never attain perfect sinlessness because sin inheres in him until death. But we strive for the goal that is set before us and by daily contrition and faith make progress in our Christian life. We look forward to the life to come when we shall be cleansed of every defilement of sin and shall share with Christ His perfect life.

Cf. Rom. 12:2; I Cor. 6:9-11; II Cor. 5:14-15 and 7:1; Eph. 2:10; Phil.

2:13 and 3:12; Col. 1:10 and 2:6; I Thess. 4:3; Titus 2:11-14; I Peter 1:15; I John 3:6-9.

IX. THE CHURCH

We believe and teach:

All believers in Christ constitute the one, holy, apostolic (in agreement with the Apostles' doctrine), and catholic (universal) Church. Jesus Christ is its Head. Through the means of grace He calls all its members into fellowship with Himself, and also unites the members in fellowship with one another.

To all members of His Church the Lord has given all the rights and prerogatives set forth in His Word. Every Christian has the right of direct access to God without a human mediator.

To the Church has been given the commission to preach the Gospel and to administer the Sacraments. It is therefore the duty of Christians to unite in local congregations for this purpose. In such local congregations the presence or activity of any unbelievers or hypocrites does not nullify the power of the Word of God. The efficacy of the means of grace does not depend on the faith of the administrant, but inheres in the Word of God itself.

In this present world Christ does not promise His Church any earthly reign over the affairs of men. His Church will remain a kingdom of the cross until His return for judgment; but He will sustain it according to His promise. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. 16:18b.

It is the duty of the Church to be faithful to its Lord and His Word in all its testimony, to be steadfast in its confession of His truth at all times, and to avoid and combat error. It is the duty of the Church to mold and keep its practice in conformity with the Lord's directives in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore we dare not condone error or have altar and pulpit fellowship and un-Scriptural co-operation with erring individuals, church bodies, or church groups that refuse to be corrected by God's Word. We must also be alert and susceptible to the Lord's leading to establish and maintain fellowship with those whom He has made one with us in the faith, and to seek to win the erring and wayward for unity in the true faith. We are mindful of our Lord's intercessory prayer that we, who are His brethren, may be one, even as He and the Father are one.

Cf. Matt. 28; John 8:31-32; 15; 17; 20:22-23; Romans 12:3-8; 16; I Cor. 1:10; 3; 12; Eph. 2; 4:1-16; 5-6-11; Col. 1; I Tim. 6; I Peter 2:9-10; I John 4:1; II John 9-10.

X. THE MINISTRY

We believe and teach:

The ministry of the Word and Sacraments exists by divine ordinance. God continues to call men into this holy office and entrusts the spiritual wel-

fare of His congregations to these pastors as His gifts to the Church. It is the will of God that congregations choose as their pastors only such men as have the qualifications outlined in the Holy Scriptures. Pastors are required by God to be faithful and as faithful pastors are entitled to the love and respect of their congregations.

Cf. Acts 20:28; Rom. 10:12-18; I Cor. 4:1-2; II Cor. 4; Eph. 4:11-15; I Tim. 3; 5:17; Heb. 13:7-17.

XI. THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS

We believe and teach:

The Lutheran Confessions (Book of Concord 1580) are true exhibitions of the truths of the Holy Scriptures. Therefore it is rightfully required that every pastor and congregation in the Lutheran Church subscribe to and uphold the doctrines taught in these Confessions without any omission, deviation, or reservation.

XII. THE LAST THINGS

We believe and teach:

The Church of Jesus Christ will exist and endure on earth, according to the promises of Christ, until His return for judgment. When Christ returns for judgment He will raise up all the dead—all believers in Him to eternal life, and all others to everlasting damnation.

Among the signs of His approaching return for judgment the distinguishing features of the Antichrist, as portrayed in the Holy Scriptures, are still clearly discernible in the Roman papacy, the climax of all human usurpations of Christ's authority in the Church. We hold it to be an error to teach anything as a sign of Christ's second advent not promised or foretold in the Holy Scriptures, such as the expectation of a mass conversion of the Jews, a preliminary resurrection of martyrs, and a visible millennial reign of Christ on earth before the Day of Judgment.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time, wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations; that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ; Whom having not seen, ye love; in Whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full

of glory; receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls," I Peter 1:3-9.

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is," I John 3:2.

Cf. Matt. 16:18; John 5:28-29; 6:40; 18:36; Romans 11; II Thess. 2:1-10; I John 2:18; Rev. 20.

Notes and Studies

THE STATE AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

EDWARD W. UTHE

In his book *Teacher in America*, Jacques Barzun points out the modern tendency to regard education with something like messianic hope. More and better education seems to be the remedy for all the world's ills. At the opening exercises of the University of Pennsylvania in the fall of 1949 the principal speaker pointed out that one of the failings of western civilization has been that it has paid little attention to religion. These two emphases, education on the one hand and religion on the other, have combined to present problems to the American public school system. If the test of importance is newspaper publicity these problems rank with the communist trials and certain aspects of the President's "fair deal" program. In the spring of 1948 the McCollum case and its implications received considerable attention in the press, and during last summer the heated exchange of letters between the Cardinal Archbishop of New York and a former "first lady" was headline news.

These are the two most important problems which are current in the area of church and state relationships in education, but they are not the only ones. Currently the United Secularists are filing suit against Bible reading in New Jersey public schools. In New Mexico four public school teachers are being charged with propagandizing their pupils with Protestantism. There is a great deal of discussion about such questions, but far too much of the discussion either ignores or assumes the factor which must be most important in the settlement of all questions concerning the relationship of church (or religion) and state in education. The deciding factor is what the law says. Federal and state constitutions, statutes

and court decisions are the authorities which ultimately define the relationship.¹

The final court of appeal for all these questions is the Supreme Court of the United States, and this tribunal bases its judgments primarily on the Constitution. It is therefore necessary, first of all, to determine whether the Constitution contains anything that is relevant to these kinds of problems. The first amendment is the most obviously relevant section: "... Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . ." Objections to an established church were partly the result of American antipathy toward all things British, including an establishment, and partly the result of the extreme diversity of religious groups in America. No single denomination could claim enough members to pretend to be anything like a "national" church, and all denominations would protest the establishment of any denomination other than themselves. Nineteenth century Supreme Court decisions show that the intent was not to divorce religion (or even the Christian religion specifically) from the civil life of the nation. A more recent trend in court decisions has been to erect a "wall" of separation even more substantial than that proposed by Jefferson.

A second section of the Constitution which has relevance in this discussion is the fourteenth amendment:

... No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The unquestioned intention of this amendment was to protect the rights of the Negro in the south. The first ten amendments limited the federal government; the fourteenth amendment placed state governments under the same limitations. Until 1880 no court de-

1 Excerpts from constitutions may be found in the *Index Digest of State Constitutions* (Albany, N. Y., 1915) and in Conrad H. Moehlman, *The American Constitutions and Religion* (Berne, Ind., 1938). A summary of statutes and court decisions may be found in Carl Zollman, *American Church Law* (St. Paul, Minn., 1933).

cision applied this amendment to anything except the rights of Negroes. Since 1880 its interpretation has been broadened to include the prohibition of *any* kind of discrimination, including religious, by states.

Many cases will not get as far as the United States Supreme Court: they will be decided on the basis of state constitutions. Obviously there is diversity among state constitutions in sections relevant to the relationship of church and state in education. In spite of the diversity, there is a generally uniform spirit. Quotations from a few state constitutions will demonstrate this.

New Mexico: . . . : nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship (Art. II, Section 11).

Wyoming: No appropriation shall be made . . . to any denominational or sectarian institution or association (Art. III, Section 36).

Ohio: . . . ; but no religious or other sect, or sects, shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of, any part of the school funds of this state (Art. VI, Section 2).

While there is general agreement in the state constitutions that the state is not in any way to support any kind of religious organization or school, there are some exceptions. In 1938 an amendment to the constitution of the state of New York was adopted which specifically permits transportation of parochial school pupils at public expense.

The difference between state constitutions and laws have been reflected in state court decisions, and even in Supreme Court decisions on cases appealed from state courts. In 1922 the New York State Supreme Court (the lowest court of New York) declared that public funds could not be used to furnish textbooks or other supplies to parochial schools. In 1930 the United States Supreme Court declared that public funds in Louisiana could be used to supply textbooks for parochial school pupils. In 1947 the United States Supreme Court allowed the transportation of parochial school pupils in New Jersey to be paid for with public funds. The most

recent and perhaps the most important case was the McCollum case, decided by the United States Supreme Court March 8, 1948.²

In Champaign, Illinois, the public schools excused pupils in the fourth through the ninth grade one period a week for religious instruction. There were separate classes for Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant pupils, and lesson materials and curriculum were to be of such nature as to avoid any sectarian teaching. In 1945, Mrs. Vashti McCollum, a professed atheist, sought to have the school board enjoined from permitting religious instruction in public schools and/or in its buildings. Mrs. McCollum contended that the purpose of the classes was to inculcate in the pupils the sectarian beliefs of the teachers, that children of atheists and small denominations were being proselyted, that children not participating suffered social pressure and ostracism, that the Board of Education showed discrimination among religious groups in allowing the use of school buildings and property, and that the Board of Education spent public funds illegally by paying for the printing of registration cards for religious classes.

Mrs. McCollum lost her case in the Illinois Circuit Court and in the Illinois Supreme Court, to which she appealed. She then appealed the case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Four opinions were handed down by this court, two of which were in favor of the plaintiff. These two opinions together accounted for eight of the ten justices who heard the case. Justice Black's opinion, concurred in by three other members of the court, drew a sharp line between religion and the state. The government is not permitted to do *anything* either to aid or to hinder religion in any way. The Champaign plan aided religion, and was therefore unconstitutional. Justice Frankfurter filed a supplementary opinion which was concurred in by three justices. This opinion finds the Champaign plan objectionable largely because "Religious education . . . is patently woven into the working scheme of the school. . . ." Justice Jackson filed a separate opinion in which he concurred in the de-

2 A thorough discussion of the McCollum case may be found in the October, 1948, issue of the *Temple Law Quarterly* in an article entitled "The McCollum Case," by Ralph D. Owen.

cision of the court, but pointed out the near impossibility of removing everything connected with religion from education and expressed doubts as to the jurisdiction of the court over the case. Justice Reed filed a sharply dissenting opinion. He maintained that the Champaign plan was constitutional, for it did not prohibit the free exercise of religion, and that the small amount of expense borne by the Board of Education was incidental and analagous to payments of public funds to hospitals owned by religious groups.

Two factors contribute to making the implication of the McCollum case for released-time religious education vague. The first is that the decision applies only to programs very similar to the Champaign program, and the second is the ambiguity of the delivered opinions and their conflicting points of view. Even though the implications of the decision in this case are not clear, this decision must be regarded as the standard by which the various released-time programs are to be judged as to their legality, for it is the only United States Supreme Court decision directly concerned with the problem. It has provided a legal precedent which will undoubtedly be referred to in all future cases, and it no doubt will have a substantial influence upon future court decisions.

The decision in the McCollum case declared that the Champaign plan of released-time religious education violated the first amendment as applied to the states by the fourteenth amendment in that "... the state's tax-supported public school buildings are used for the dissemination of religious doctrines. . . ." and that the state aids sectarian groups in recruiting pupils for religious education "through the use of the state's compulsory public school machinery. . . ." Apparently there were two factors in the Champaign plan which rendered it unconstitutional, and which would render any plan containing either of those two factors unconstitutional. They are: (1) the use of public school buildings, and (2) the use of public school machinery.

The decision does not indicate what kinds of programs might be permitted, but this may be deduced from what is prohibited. It would seem that "dismissed-time" plans would be constitutional. Typical of these plans would be the well-known "Gary (Indiana)

Plan." Under this plan pupils are excused from school, upon the request of their parents, to study religion at home or at a church school of their choice. The pupils go either from home to church school to public school, or from public school to church school to home. The public school is not concerned either with what is taught in church school classes or with the attendance of pupils at such classes. Plans similar to this are operated in New York state, particularly in New York city, and have been declared constitutional by the New York State Supreme Court since the McCollum decision.

The May-June, 1949 issue of *Religious Education* contains a list of six suggestions which might be followed to assure a released-time program's being constitutional, even under the most strict interpretation of the McCollum decision. They are as follows: (1) church buildings and parish houses should be used for all classes in religious education; (2) the classes should be held outside of the regular school hours; (3) if it is possible and expedient to do so, an attempt should be made to change the school hours in such a way as to allow more time for outside religious instruction; (4) the attendance of pupils at all religious education classes should be voluntary, enforced only by the church and by parents; (5) all expenses connected with religious instruction should be paid for with church funds; (6) the assistance and/or supervision of public school officials should not be used. A program of religious education which met these six conditions surely would be safe from legal attack, but it seems to the writer that such a program could hardly be called "released-time," or even "dismissed-time." It would be a voluntary program conducted by the church, which is perhaps the best solution to the problem of week-day religious education.

It may be of interest to note some of the interpretations of the McCollum case which have been given by state and local authorities. These interpretations range from the prohibition of all released-time programs to the tolerance of programs very similar to the Champaign program. Since the decision, seventeen states allow released-time programs to continue substantially as they

had been operated previous to the decision. (Previous to the decision forty states had allowed some type of released-time program.) The states in which programs continue include Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota, Oregon, California, and Texas. Local programs have been continued in some states which do not allow released time. It has been estimated that approximately ninety per cent of the programs in operation before the McCollum decision have continued in operation since then.

Two examples will show the liberal interpretation given to the decision by some states. On November 15, 1948, the New York State Supreme Court ruled against Joseph Lewis, the president of the national Free Thinkers Society, and upheld the released-time plan operating in New York city. In February, 1949, a judge ruled that voluntary released-time religious education classes held in public school buildings in Arlington county, Virginia, were legal. The ruling was based on an opinion of the attorney-general of Virginia.

Not all states have interpreted the McCollum decision so liberally. As a result of the decision the teaching of the Bible in state teachers' colleges in Missouri is banned. In Illinois, public school pupils may no longer be excused for confirmation instruction. In Wisconsin any released-time plan which uses "school regulations to facilitate attendance" is illegal. In Colorado pupils cannot be released from classes for religious instruction either in or out of school buildings. The many different interpretations demonstrate clearly the failure of the McCollum decision to provide a definite standard for judging the various types of released-time programs, legal or illegal, and the need for further clarification.

There is another Supreme Court decision having implications for released-time religious education, which is generally overlooked. It is commonly referred to as the Oregon school case. In 1922 the Oregon legislature passed a law which would require all children in Oregon to attend public schools after a certain date. The law was confirmed by a referendum. The effect of the law would have been to abolish all private and parochial schools. A Roman

Catholic order of sisters, which operated a parochial school, and several military schools instituted court action. The case eventually reached the Supreme Court of the United States, which declared the law a violation of the Constitution as it "unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. . . The child is not the creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

In 1925 this Oregon case was cited by two of the three courts which upheld a released-time program of religious education in White Plains, New York. The right of parents to control the education of their children, within certain limits, was said to justify the releasing of children from public school, for a limited time each week, upon their parents' request, to attend classes in religious instruction. The defendants in the McCollum case (those who defended the released-time program) also cited the Oregon case in their briefs presented to the Illinois courts and to the United States Supreme Court. The defendants maintained that if parents have the right to send their children to a private school, and withdraw them from public schools altogether, then parents certainly have the right to withdraw their children from public school for a limited time so that they might receive religious instruction. When the McCollum case and the Oregon case are viewed together, two conclusions may be drawn. (1) Any released-time program of religious education using public school buildings or machinery is illegal. (2) Other programs of released-time religious education are legal; indeed, it would be illegal for a public school to deny the right of parents to withdraw their children from school for a limited period in order to give them religious instruction. Practice in some states does not conform with one or both of these principles, and it is likely that practice will vary until the Supreme Court clarifies its position.

The Supreme Court decision in the McCollum case has direct bearing upon one current major problem in the area of church and state educational relationships. It also has implications for a sec-

ond major problem, that of public aid to denominational schools. This second question has gained considerable notoriety as a result of discussions concerning federal aid to education. It is not exaggerating to say that the reason Congress failed to act on a federal-aid-to-education bill in 1949 was that parochial school interests prevented the passage of any bill restricting benefits to public schools (or even allowing the states to restrict the benefits to public schools), and that no bill granting aid to parochial schools could gain enough support to pass.³

The McCollum decision has made it questionable whether it is legal for the federal government to grant aid to parochial as well as to public schools. Before that decision it was generally held that the federal government was not prohibited from making financial grants to sectarian institutions. Thus financial grants to hospitals controlled by religious groups were held by courts to be constitutional. The McCollum decision apparently would disallow any grants of public funds to any institution controlled by a religious group. The situation within the states is fortunately much clearer than that in the federal government. In nearly every state the state constitution specifically prohibits the use of public funds for the support of non-public schools. (See the sections of the state constitutions quoted earlier in this article.) It is for this reason that parochial school interests are opposed to any measure that would allow the several states to decide the question of whether federal funds would be granted to parochial as well as public schools.

Although direct aid is generally prohibited, there are other areas of public support of non-public schools. Public funds may not be used to pay the tuition of pupils in non-public schools, according to court decisions in Kentucky and South Dakota. In Illinois, New York, and Tennessee school boards may rent quarters for classes in buildings owned by religious groups if there is no religious instruction and no religious influence. In Nebraska and

3 This may seem a startling statement. It is, however, based on the history of federal-aid bills in Congress in 1949, which will be discussed later in this article. The facts of this history may be found in the *Journal* of the National Education Association for October, 1949, and for November, 1949.

Indiana public school buildings may be used for religious purposes when such practice does not interfere with regular school activities.

A question of wider interest, and one that figured in discussions of federal aid, is the question of the provision of textbooks by the state for parochial school pupils. Here again practice varies from state to state. In 1922 the highest court of New York declared that public funds could not be used to furnish textbooks or other supplies for parochial schools. There was a similar decision by a New Mexico court in 1949, although it is being evaded by giving the textbooks to the pupils rather than to the schools. In 1930 a Louisiana law which provided textbooks for all school children of the state was supported by the United States Supreme Court. Another question which was included in discussions concerning federal aid was that of transportation. In the measures before Congress, attempts to prohibit the use of federal funds for the transportation of pupils were defeated, as were attempts to require that states provide transportation for all pupils. Here again there is diversity in state practices. There have been recent court decisions against the transportation of parochial school pupils at public expense in New Mexico and in the state of Washington, while an amendment to the New York state constitution specifically allows the practice, as does a United States Supreme Court decision in a New Jersey case in 1947 (Everson case).⁴

For the last twenty years attempts have been made in Congress to pass measures which would give federal aid to state educational systems. Until recently the proposals always included provisions for federal control, to a limited extent, as well as federal financial aid. Only recently has the question of aid to non-public schools entered into the discussion. It is interesting to note that Roman Catholic spokesmen opposed all proposals of federal aid to education until the recent proposals included parochial as well as public schools in their benefits.

In the spring of 1948 the Senate passed a bill, sponsored by Senator Taft, which would have given aid to the states for pur-

4 An excellent discussion of all such questions may be found in Alvin W. Johnson and Frank H. Yost, *Separation of Church and State in the United States* (Minneapolis, Minn., 1948).

poses of education, allowing the several states to follow their own practices in regard to aid to parochial schools. The bill died at the end of the session without any action by the House of Representatives.

The same thing happened in 1949. On May 5 the Senate passed Bill S 246, the Taft-Thomas Bill, by a vote of 58 to 15. The bill had been delayed in being reported out of committee during the efforts to agree on a health bill which would grant certain health services to all school children. The main provisions of the Taft-Thomas Bill were: (1) an authorization of 300 million dollars per annum of federal aid to education, (2) a prohibition of federal control of educational policies, (3) distribution of the largest amounts of aid to the neediest states, (4) a guaranteed minimum apportionment per child, (5) equitable treatment for schools for minority racial groups, and (6) the expenditure of federal funds to be guided by the principles guiding the expenditure of state funds. The bill was passed in this form despite the demands of the National Catholic Welfare Conference that aid to parochial schools be specifically included in the bill.

The Senate bill was sent to a subcommittee on federal aid to education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings were held in May and June. On June 7 the subcommittee reported favorably on H. R. 4643, the Barden Bill. The Barden Bill was substantially the same as the Taft-Thomas Bill, except that it prohibited the use of federal funds for the transportation of *any* pupils.

No action was taken during the summer. Father William E. McManus, spokesman for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, condemned both the Taft-Thomas and Barden bills. Cardinal Spellman denounced Representative Barden rather severely, and engaged in a spirited correspondence with Mrs. Roosevelt. At the end of the summer recess, John Lesinski, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, refused to call any committee meetings from August 2 to August 22. (Lesinski is a Roman Catholic from Detroit.) If the bill had been reported out of committee there is little doubt that it would have been passed.

Lesinski was finally forced to call a committee meeting when thirteen members of the committee presented a written petition. When the committee met, Lesinski held a second meeting in an adjoining room in order to prevent a quorum from acting to report the bill out of committee. Lesinski later dissolved the subcommittee which had approved the Barden Bill, and he and Speaker McCormack of the House were able to prevent a federal-aid bill from coming before the House for the remainder of the session. According to the *National Education Association Journal* there is no question that Lesinski and McCormack prevented action on a federal-aid-to-education bill, and that they did so because no bill acceptable to the Roman Catholic church could be passed.

The two main questions which have been discussed in this article are indicative of the problems which exist in the relationship between church and state in education. They are not the only problems. In Pennsylvania the Amish continue to seek exemptions from compulsory school attendance for their children. In Colorado the employment of nuns as public school teachers is being contested in court. A Unitarian in Ohio recently asked the school board to consider ending Bible reading and prayer in public classrooms. Our American position of "separation of church and state" no longer seems to be crystal-clear. It now requires a more exact formulation than is at present available if the many problems that are arising are to be solved satisfactorily.

THE SOCIAL THEOLOGY OF J. H. W. STUCKENBERG

HAROLD A. DURFEE

One of the earliest attempts in American religious thought to combine Lutheran theology with the spirit and emphasis of the American Social Gospel was made by J. H. W. Stuckenberg. Stuckenberg lived in America and Europe from 1835 to 1903 and his writings stand as a landmark in the history and development of American Lutheranism. They remain today of considerable interest to the growing number of those who attempt this synthesis.

It seems appropriate therefore, to look again at the theological framework from which Stuckenberg developed one of the earliest American statements concerning Christian sociology. It may also be of interest to note that he was one of the earliest American theologians to be acquainted with the work of Soren Kierkegaard.¹

Turning to theology we find that Stuckenberg writes very little about the nature of God as such. Although the doctrine of God is not analyzed, it is obvious by implication that Stuckenberg stands in the line of Reformation Protestantism. He emphasizes the transcendence and sovereignty of God, as God is not to be identified with nature or humanity. "We are entirely dependent upon Him, not He on us."² Such analysis places Stuckenberg in constant opposition to a view of God as so thoroughly immanent that God is identified with the world or humanity. Stuckenberg's God is a reality and not merely a wish projection or a deification of nature. Thus he opposes the naturalizing and humanizing tendencies which developed in American religious liberalism including the American Social Gospel.

The chief emphasis and the heart of Stuckenberg's thought is concerned with the doctrine of man and its implications for other doctrines. The nature of human existence and the problems with which man is faced are expressed most clearly in the analysis of the "fall." We have already noted man's dependence upon God. Man was created with a two-fold nature. He was made in the image of God and therefore was free; this is his spiritual nature. It is this which makes man man, as distinguished from the animal. This indestructible spiritual nature is pure, granting man sinlessness.

In the fall man lost his purity, became unlike God in respect to purity, and thus is sinful. Man's spiritual nature remains however, and is not lost in the fall. The spirituality is God's image and man's

1 For a biography of J. H. W. Stuckenberg see J. O. Evjin, *The Life of J. H. W. Stuckenberg* (Minneapolis: Lutheran Free Church Publishing Co., 1938). Evjin is quite critical of Stuckenberg's social theology. Stuckenberg does not seem to be acquainted in detail with Kierkegaard's thought. He does however, refer to him. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, *Christian Sociology*, p. 19; *Introduction to the Study of Sociology* (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1897), p. 153.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 15.

sinfulness is but a quality or state of this image. In the fall man lost his original purity, but inasmuch as he still has a spiritual nature he is like God. Man's nature is weakened but not lost; it now reflects God "either imperfectly or not at all."³ God created man in such a way that it was possible for him to sin but it was man who did sin. This very possibility however, indicates to Stuckenberg the greatness of man's character. The freedom which man misused is the very "condition for rising into companionship with God."⁴

Being in such a sinful condition man's hope lies in the Christ, who contains all that man needs. Christ came "to teach man that he is redeemable and to redeem him."⁵ He restores to its original purity man's spirituality, the lost image of God. Through his spiritual nature man retains some spiritual perception, and thus Christ can appeal to fallen man. Redeemed man now has not only the Sonship of God through creation, but the spiritual likeness to God which is likeness of spirit, having its source in regeneration. Christ restores man's real manhood which is more natural to him than is sin.

The communion with God which is possible through the Christ becomes actual only if man chooses it. "Faith is a moral act, and the will has much to do with it."⁶ Man is completely responsible for his unbelief through sin. God's love in Christ awakens a similar love in the hearts of such sinful men. All of these remarks of course, indicate the central place of personality in Stuckenberg's thought. For him it is reality. There is truth only in persons, for man as a person is to become the truth.⁷

We turn now to the consequences and implications of such regeneration. It is at this point that the connection is made between

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 105-107.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 108.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 111, 123.

6 *Ibid.*, pp. 108, 133. For remarks concerning determinism and freedom see *Introduction to the Study of Sociology* (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1897), pp. 19, 226. Stuckenberg indicates freedom cannot alter nature's laws. There are limits to human freedom, for it can act on nature only according to the laws of nature. The initiative for such acts however, may be free, as men can be controlled by reason and oppose natural evolution, and thereby move themselves.

7 J. H. W. Stuckenberg, *The Age and the Church* (Hartford: Student Publishing Co., 1893), pp. 166-167.

theology and sociology, and here Stuckenberg distinguishes Christian sociology from much of the secular sociology of his day. Christ is the creator of Christian society which manifests the truth that is in the Christ. "It is that society to which Christ has communicated his life, and which is to the world a representation of Christ and his life."⁸ In so far as men are drawn to Christ they are also drawn together, thus establishing the Kingdom of God, the perfect union of believers, of which God is the founder. The Kingdom is not of this world, but differs from kingdoms of this world in aim, character, and method. It is a spiritual Kingdom among the temporal kingdoms of this world, a Christian theocracy—God's work on earth through Christ.

Upon this basis Stuckenberg feels that not only it is possible, but it is time to develop the science of such a Christian society. There is needed a Christian sociology which has been so little developed in the history of the Christian faith. If one recognizes that love to man is as essential a part of the Christian message as is love to God, there will be no surprise at such an assertion. As God in Jesus ministers unto man, so must Christian people pour out their spiritual heart to man as spiritual. Stuckenberg thus took as his task the analysis of the society which is being so formed,—the science of society controlled by Christian principles. He analyzes the Christian's social relations, the relations of the Christian to his fellow men; for only upon such proper understanding can one perform one's duty to humanity. There is to be developed upon the basis of Christian principles not merely a study of what society is but of what it ought to be. Such social ethics are a combination of rationalism and empiricism, the ideal and the real. "The conception of what ought to be thus always depends on the conception of the nature of reality; it is but an inference from this."⁹ The mere recognition of our social nature is a recognition of the demand, fostered by society, for a limitation of our selfishness and a concern for others. The church is to be enlarged to the Kingdom of God including all the work of Christ for humanity.¹⁰ In this

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 77-79.

9 J. H. W. Stuckenberg, *Sociology* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1903), Vol. 2, p. 209.

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 300.

way Stuckenberg offers a theological basis for social Christianity and introduces the science of ethics into the study of sociology.

We may now indicate some of the basic criticisms of contemporary sociology offered by Stuckenberg. In nearly all instances contemporary sociology has failed to develop a science of society based on Christian principles. As a result sociologists tended to neglect the individual in their concern for society. Christian sociology, on the other hand, analyzes the interrelationship of the individual and society without losing sight of either, which means that there is even to be a proper self love in the life of the Christian.

Christian society does not come about as a process of natural evolution, but is a new creation. "There are in it elements which were not evolved by a process of nature, but which were communicated by a power above nature. . . . While thankfully availing itself of all the aid evolution can give it, Christian sociology offers a helping hand to evolution, in bridging over chasms which the evolution meets in its course of development."¹¹ Although appreciative of the advances in the field made by August Comte, Stuckenberg is quite critical of Comte's position. Comte's is a sociology without proper foundations, in fact, without any foundation. Stuckenberg also offers criticism of the other leading sociologist of his day, Herbert Spencer. In opposition to Spencer, Stuckenberg holds that evolution developed both homogeneity and heterogeneity, diversity as well as unity.¹² Thus the evolutionary process is not nearly as simple as Spencer thought.

I do not intend to offer criticism or defense of Stuckenberg's theology. It seems important however, to recall a theoretical development of considerable interest in the history of American theology and especially American Lutheranism. Such a study may serve to illustrate the possibility of and difficulties to be faced in

11 *Ibid.*, p. 36.

12 J. H. W. Stuckenberg, *Introduction to the Study of Sociology* (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1897), pp. 196-197. For a study of Stuckenberg's social theory see H. E. Barnes, *The Social and Political Theories of J. H. W. Stuckenberg*, *Lutheran Quarterly*, LI (1920), 384-404; C. T. Pihlblad, *The Sociology of J. H. W. Stuckenberg*, *Ohio Sociologist*, ii, No. 2 (1928).

the adjustment of social Christianity and Lutheran theology. His thought brings before us such issues as the nature of and relationship of the transcendence and immanence of God, the relationship of absolute values to relative situations, the nature of man's sin and its social and individual influence, the work of Christ relative to the evolutionary process, and the relationship of the Kingdom of God to history. It may also stand as illustration of the profound problems faced by the theologians of the American Social Gospel, and by making us more aware of the real issues may help us in moving toward their solution.

EXTENDED SERVICE

WILLIAM C. CONRADI

God's hand has never been shortened whenever it has had men as willing as Isaiah to say, "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save." Always, when these men have added, "Here am I, send me," God's hand has reached out to save and to redeem.

Only a few years ago few state institutions had full time chaplains. Many state hospitals for the mentally ill had no chaplains whatever. Ministers of nearby churches frequently held chapel services in rotation and did some visiting but a regular, systematic, pastoral contact by men trained to understand and work with the mentally ill did not exist.

The Mental Hygiene movement inaugurated by Clifford Beers in 1908 with his book, *A Mind That Found Itself*, the establishment of the Council for Clinical Training of Theological Students in 1930 under the leadership of the Reverend Anton T. Boisen, D.D., the effective chaplaincy service in World War II and in the Veterans Administration since, have helped to change all this.

A growing number of state mental hospitals are establishing full-time and part-time chaplaincies. Men are answering the call to this extended service that the hand of God may not be shortened.

But the establishment of these Protestant chaplaincies has often been a growth outside of and without the authorization of the organized church. In many instances the institution has selected its own chaplain without consulting the church body of which the chaplain was a member. The chaplain himself has not always consulted with his church superiors before accepting the post. This manner of development was to be expected in the present disorganized state of Protestantism. Perhaps no other way of procedure was feasible at the time.

Now this type of extended service, so much needed, has become an established fact. The Council of Clinical Training lists the following fourteen mental hospitals in its 1948 catalogue which are served by chaplains trained by and affiliated with its group: Bellevue Hospital, New York City; Concord State Hospital, Concord, New Hampshire; Elgin State Hospital, Elgin, Illinois; Institute of Psychological Medicine, Meninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas; Little Rock State Hospital, Little Rock, Arkansas; Manteno State Hospital, Manteno, Illinois; New Jersey State Hospital, Greystone Park, New Jersey; New Jersey State Hospital, Marboro, New Jersey; New Jersey State Hospital, Trenton, New Jersey; Norristown State Hospital, Norristown, Pennsylvania; Philadelphia State Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Rochester State Hospital, Rochester, New York; St. Elizabeth Hospital, Washington, D. C.; South Carolina State Hospital, Columbia, South Carolina. Some other state hospitals also have full-time and part-time chaplains not affiliated with the Council. Central State Hospital, Lakeland, Kentucky, and Rockland State Hospital, Orangeburg, New York, were also listed by the Association of Mental Hospital Chaplains on its official stationery in 1949. These, however, do not complete the list of mental hospitals having chaplains.

To make this work more effective the church needs to be instrumental in establishing standards for this work and it needs to tie the chaplains of its faith into a closer affiliation with its organization and with its social missions program. Reports from these chaplains frequently are not included in synodical or regional social

missions reports. No other arrangement seemingly has been established to foster interest in the special needs of this type of extended service. This is also true in the Lutheran Church.

Of the fourteen mental hospitals listed in the 1948 catalogue of the Council for Clinical Training four are served by Lutheran chaplains, all affiliated with the United Lutheran Church in America. Other Lutheran pastors are also serving as Protestant Chaplains at state hospitals.

Perhaps it would be well for Lutheran church bodies to establish through the National Lutheran Council an institutional service for these chaplains and for Lutheran pastors serving as chaplains of other state and federal institutions, similar to the service now extended to military and Veterans Administration chaplains. It is vital that Lutheranism with its balanced approach to life and its sound Gospel message should play an important part in this program. It would be an effective answer to God's question, "Is my hand shortened at all, that it cannot redeem?"

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

Book Reviews and Notices¹

Contemporary Thinking About Paul: An Anthology. Compiled by Thomas E. Kepler. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 442 pages. \$4.00.

Chapters in a Life of Paul. By John Knox. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950. 168 pages. \$2.50.

Today when all the nations are in the grip of doubt and terror described in Deut. 28:65-67, the naive optimism of 1900 has frozen into the paralyzing pessimism of 1950. So the answer to Jesus' question, "When the Son of man comes, will he find faith on the earth?" must be "Yes, but it is faith in the wrong things—fatalistic faith in the genius of man as a builder of the kingdom of Antichrist and in the impossibility of realizing the kingdom of God within history." To float as recipient spectators on the clouds of apocalyptic is ever so much easier than to pursue the task of kingdom-building, which is an integral part of God's grace-gift of salvation. But not even the most thoroughgoing eschatologist has quite succeeded in satisfying his conscience concerning the propriety of divorcing the social gospel from the gospel in the heart of the individual and the kingdom on earth from the kingdom in heaven by recourse to the concept of "realized eschatology." Like the social gospeler whom he condemns, he has gone to the Scriptures seeking justification of the faith that is in him. In both cases the result is therefore a onesided conception. Paul especially has always suffered from the partial understanding of his followers. The only remedy is to read widely in, with, and all around the subject as presented in the diverse schools of interpretation.

That is what Dr. Kepler has done. "During my college and seminary days," he says, "I found Paul an interesting per-

sonality to study. I viewed him with the same objective approach with which I appreciated Augustine, John Wesley, or Martin Luther, except that I paid him added deference since his writings were in the Bible. Several years after graduate-school days, I began to find Paul more perplexing than helpful; I felt that he diffused rather than clearly interpreted the Christian epic. I turned instead to the Synoptic tradition as the interpretive clue to Jesus in the New Testament. But this confusion was not to last. I began to study Paul more comprehensively, to try to see more clearly why great minds like Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and Karl Barth could find him so alluring and so stimulating. My quest was not in vain, for I began to find the meaning of Paul for today, generally through reading or rereading most of the major works on Paul, but specifically through perusing the small classic by C. Harold Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for Today*."

In this Anthology, Dr. Kepler shares his reading with us by giving fifty-five selections from the contemporary interpreters of Paul which he has found particularly helpful in his quest. The selections are presented under five headings: the religious atmosphere of Paul's world; biographical data—the man and his experience; the letters of Paul; insights into Pauline theology; and modern evaluations of Paul. An appendix gives a bibliography, a biographical index of the authors, and an index of titles. The extracts are fairly representative of the best work of the respective authors, and the 442 closely printed pages of the Anthology furnish the gist of the most important

¹ Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

discussions on Paul during the present century. Much of the material has been gathered from journals and from books that are out of print, or otherwise hard to obtain.

The compiler's plan and criteria of selection can be stated best in his own words: "Here as in my other anthologies* I faced the problem of selection. Various schools of New Testament interpretation and unusual and penetrating viewpoints are represented in the fellowship, with the purpose of covering with relative completeness the central Pauline problems. Some scholars could easily have been heard several times in this anthology, but in order to have a wide representation of contributors I have allowed them to speak but once. If several well-known scholars are omitted in this volume, it is because their most stimulating writings lie in non-Pauline New Testament areas. While several of the contributors, such as Weinel, Wrede, Weiss, may doubtfully be called 'contemporary,' their writings are included, since their influence earlier in this century has left a vital stimulus upon recent Pauline studies."

The order in which the extracts are printed yields as nearly as possible a consecutive story and logical development. A good balance is kept between historical and theological materials. "As we study Paul's letters," says Dr. Kepler, "we need to use the religious-historical approach. Our first task is to become objective historians who live in the first century and attempt to see what Paul in his sentences is saying to the people of that time. Our second task is to return to the twentieth century and ask with care, 'Which of Paul's ideas still have value for us today, because they are pragmatic and coherent?' If such a method is employed in trying to understand the meaning of Paul for today, much confusion can be avoided, and the Apostle can be retained as a helpful contemporary."

In general, each extract gives a clear

picture of its author's position and special contribution to our understanding of Paul. Occasionally one could wish that an author had been allowed to speak twice. Frank C. Porter is selected to speak on "The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul" (reprinted from *JBL*, XLI, 1922). In addition, a selection from Prof. Porter's later work, *The Mind of Christ in Paul*, would have introduced the reader to one of the greatest books ever written on Paul's experience of Christ—a book which no student of Paul should miss reading. J. Moffatt's treatises on Love, Grace, and Faith in the New Testament, and E. D. Burton's word studies in his Commentary on Galatians are needed to supplement Anders Nygren's "The Agape of the Cross" in this Anthology.

In evaluating each contribution in relation to its author's work as a whole, we need to remember that the extracts not only invite but require further reading. As far as foreign works are concerned, only those are represented that happen to have been translated into English; and the incentives and available money to translate and to publish translations are not always directed to give us the best that has been written abroad.

As would be expected of a good anthology, the various schools of interpretation are given a fair hearing. Hence there are frequent clashes of opinion. But this is just what the student ought to welcome if he wishes to master the problems of Pauline exegesis and gain an integral understanding of Paul's religion and theology. Towards the middle of the second century a Christian leader writing in the name of Peter complained that there were some things in the letters of Paul "hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction" (II Pet. 3:16). Ability to perceive twistings by others and to guard against one's own

*The others are: "The Fellowship of the Saints," "Contemporary Religious Thought," and "Contemporary Thinking About Jesus."

comes only from wide reading and experience. To that end this Anthology is as welcome as it will be useful. In proportion as it sets us to study the Scriptures for ourselves and equips us to draw our own conclusions, we shall find not only that Paul "can be retained as a helpful contemporary," but that he is an indispensable companion on our journey of faith in Christ.

The latest of the books excerpted in Kepler's Anthology is *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, by John Knox. This is not a biography, but a fresh and stimulating discussion of the most important problems which concern the biographer—the nature and use of our sources; comparison of the story in Paul's letters with the evidence of Acts; places and dates; an estimate of the man and his work; and a study of his initial revelation, his conception of "the New Creation," and his life as "a man in Christ."

In constructing the chronology, Dr. Knox observes that although the biographers of Paul know that his letters are the *primary* source, they have generally interpreted the letters by Acts, forcing them into *Luke's* scheme. To correct this mistake, he begins by combing the epistles for chronological data, and then from these data he constructs the chronology as it would be inferred if we did not have the book of Acts. He does not, of course, discard Acts, but in all cases where there is a conflict (*e.g.*, Gal. 1-2 vs. Acts 15) he follows the letters, without feeling bound to harmonize the two either way. Where Acts differs he shows how Luke's special interests may have modified or determined his construction of the chronology. By this method Dr. Knox arrives at the following scheme:

"Conversion (depending on how we interpret 'fourteen years') A. D. 34 or 37
First visit to Jerusalem ('three years later') 37 or 40

Evangelistic activity in Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Macedonia, Greece, and Asia (possibly elsewhere) 37 or 40 to 51

Second visit to Jerusalem (conference) 51

Taking of offering and other evangelistic activity in Asia Minor and Greece 51 to 53

Final visit to Jerusalem to take the offering; the arrest there 53 or 54"

This hypothesis has two decided advantages. According to the usual construction, "the active career of Paul—in Galatia, Macedonia, Greece, Asia—as it is reflected in the letters must be compressed into a space too small for it, the eight or nine years between 46 and 55," whereas, also on the basis of this customary interpretation, the fourteen years between Gal. 1:18 and 2:1 have to be designated as "silent" years. The revision proposed by Dr. Knox allows sufficient time for Paul's great work. The second advantage is that it fits much better with the most natural interpretation of the chronological references in extra-biblical writers that are relevant to the Pauline chronology (*e.g.*, the Delphi Inscription, Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, Dio Cassius, Orosius).

The new hypothesis requires a drastic revision of our atlases, which trace Paul's "missionary journeys" on the basis of Acts. From the Fundamentalists' standpoint it will be quite unacceptable, because at certain points it involves an adverse judgment on the historical accuracy of Acts. Yet we have to recognize that *any* harmonization of Acts with Paul is a *human* construction, and hence can lay no claim to infallibility, however much it may satisfy the minds of its advocates. As Dr. Knox observes, "Many writers seem to proceed on the assumption that for some reason Luke was more accurately informed on matters concerning which Paul happens to be silent than on matters concerning which Paul happens to have spoken. One of them once said to me, 'But if we cannot rely confidently upon Acts, what is left us? We would not be able to write a life of Paul at all'—as though such a consideration had anything to do with the question of the reliability of Acts!"

Dr. Knox first proposed this recon-

struction in *The Journal of Religion*, XVI (1936), 341 ff., and in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII (1939), 15 ff. In the discussion since then he has given up his original identification of II Cor. 12:1-4 with Paul's conversion experience, but his general scheme does not depend upon the interpretation of this particular passage. As for the chronological order of the letters, we observe that, on this hypothesis, Galatians, which was written after the Jerusalem conference, could not have been earlier than A. D. 51, "in the period of Paul's residence in Ephesus toward the end of his active career." The letters to the Thessalonians are placed ten years earlier than the usual dating—"perhaps not long after A. D. 40," from Athens (I Thess. 3:1-6); although there is no evidence in the letter against Corinth, where, because of Acts 18:5, these letters are usually assigned." First Corinthians, "composed in Asia, probably Ephesus," and II Corinthians (1-9, "in Macedonia, probably Philippi") were written "probably" in A. D. 51-53; the place of II Cor. 10-13 is uncertain. [A recent suggestion by L. P. Pherigo assigns it to Rome after Paul's release from his "first" imprisonment there; cf. *J B L*, LXVIII, 341-350.] Dr. Knox dates Romans from Corinth, A. D. 53-54. Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians he thinks may have been written during an imprisonment in Ephesus some time between the years 47 and 50; "but there is nothing decisive against the usual date, during the Roman imprisonment described at the very end of Acts." Ephesians is treated as an introduction to the collected letters of Paul, written a generation after Paul by the collector, who may have been Onesimus. [But see Charles H. Buck, "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus," *J B L*, LXVIII, 351-357, for a discussion of certain difficulties raised by this theory of the origin of Ephesians.]

Against the growing tendency to treat the theology of Paul as if it could be abstracted from the history in which it

is rooted, the special merit of these "Chapters" is to keep the two together. Following the line laid down in his earlier book, *Christ the Lord* (1945), Dr. Knox shows how Paul himself did this.

Paul began with the living Christ, who, notwithstanding his death and "ascension," had never for a moment been absent from the fellowship of his followers. "For the empirical basis of faith in the Resurrection of Christ is nothing less, or more, than this realized continuity between past and present—between the one remembered as the human master and friend and the one now known as the divine Spirit of the fellowship. This continuity was not a conclusion from the Resurrection; on the contrary, the Resurrection (if conceived as a momentary incident in time and place) was itself an inference from the known, self-authenticating character of this continuity." Thus the Jesus who was remembered and the Christ who continued to be present as the Spirit were one and the same.

Those who share this continuing fellowship "in Christ" already share a new and endless life, so that "death is swallowed up in victory." Having emphasized this fact as the foundation of the Easter faith, Dr. Knox continues:

"Paul knows of course that the full meaning of this victory cannot be realized within history. The order of pure love and of full and endless life, if it should enter into history, would by its very coming destroy history: 'Flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of God' (I Cor. 15:50)."

But here it is essential to make a distinction. Paul is not speaking of the terrestrial but of the celestial phase of the kingdom. On earth "flesh and blood" can and do inherit it; otherwise there could have been no incarnation either in the physical body of Jesus or in his continuing body the church. Moreover in this chapter Paul is not speaking of destroying *history* but of "destroying every rule and every authority and power" that have been opposing God's eternal kingdom.

And unless we are to interpret "the perfect" in I Cor. 13:10 as a static existence, it would seem that this kingdom will have a history even in heaven. We cannot believe that sin and death have a monopoly on the making of history. On the contrary it is sin and not "the order of pure love and of full and endless life" that destroys history (Rom. 8:19-23).

An endlessness for the individual that would confine him forever to this earth in a physical body would indeed be incompatible with the Creator's original blessing in Gen. 1:28, "Be fruitful and multiply." Earth has neither space nor opportunities to satisfy the billions of human beings in whose hearts God has set eternity. The recognition of this fact, however, does not mean that the pure love and full life of God's "eschatological" kingdom would destroy history on earth. Rather this new order would transform history by removing and preventing sin, which is the sting of death. The transformation described by Paul in II Cor. 3:17-18 begins here on earth and does not have to wait until we die and go to heaven. It is true that Paul's primary concern was to transform individuals for the life hereafter, which they would live "clothed" in a celestial body, and that he regarded the present sinful social order as passing away, together with its wicked rulers and their head, the self-worshipping "Man of lawlessness" (II Thess. 2:1-12). It is also true that he did not think of God's kingdom on earth as requiring thousands or millions of years for its realization. He expected the Day of judgment to be sudden and soon, bringing a miraculous destruction of the wicked and the removal of the saints to live in heaven. But since his letters do not tell us what he thought God would do with this physical earth after the purge, all we can say with assurance is that he did not expect this world to be his eternal home. Today, viewing God's kingdom on earth in the light of its ongoing history—now almost two thousand times longer than Paul anticipated when he wrote his

first letter to the Thessalonians—we can see another possibility: that God, working in and through man, will some day "realize" it in history and continue to use this earth as a spiritual nursery to get human souls started on the first stage of their eternal life.

As a Christian, Paul found himself engaged in a war with the flesh that had been intensified by the very Spirit that was empowering him to win it. So, with his foreshortened view of history, he did regard his present life "in Christ" as only a foretaste and first installment of the glory that was to come. But our present tendency to press the differences between the celestial and the terrestrial phases of God's kingdom to the point of virtual discontinuity overlooks the fact that the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23; I Cor. 13) which Paul tasted on earth was the same fruit that he expected to enjoy in heaven. Otherwise our life here could not even be a preparation for life hereafter, and mundane history would be meaningless sound and fury. Faith, hope, and love could not "abide" if they, along with the people who love, hope, and believe, were not also a part of God's eternal "eschatological" order. The hypothesis of discontinuity between history and the kingdom of God is hopelessly embarrassed by the question, Why is this earth, and why its history?

Recognition of the fact that Paul did not think in terms of an indefinitely long period of development for the kingdom within history does not compel us to adopt the hypothesis that God intends to put an end to history by a sudden catastrophic intervention instead of transforming it. The taproot of this counsel of despair is the failure of the church, during these nineteen centuries since Paul, to be as intensely concerned as he was to persuade all men to receive the Spirit and taste the celestial fruit right now. Failure of nerve results from mistrusting the transforming potential of life "in Christ" as applied to the environment in which the transformed individual has to live. Paul

conceived his task primarily as an ambassador of Christ to individuals, rather than to reform society, but that restriction was imposed by the particular historical situation in which he had to work, and was not inherent in his ambassadorship. He started a social ferment which has never ceased to act in human history. What we need today is to speed the process by freeing it from the retarding effects of a partial conception of the Christian mission which limits it to the salvation of individuals for the celestial hereafter while consigning history to a predestined apocalyptic degeneration. Through new occasions the Spirit is waiting to teach new duties. Paul's colonies of heaven have now spread to the point where, as co-workers with God, and empowered by his Spirit, they can produce incalculably greater changes in history than ever before. If we have faith as a grain of mustard to remove mountains we will not abandon to the tender mercies of an antichristian Revolution our Christian function of transforming history.

"Why not do evil that good may come?" was the question that Paul's opponents hurled at him when he preached "justification" by grace alone through faith in Christ. They wanted to know what ground there is for ethical obligation when one is "in Christ." Dr. Knox thinks that "Paul nowhere convincingly answers this question." He points out that Rom. 6 "takes the form of a demonstration that the believer *will* be righteous, not of an explanation of why he *ought* to be." But we need not conclude from this that "Paul has no persuasive *theoretical* basis" for continuing to insist on ethical obligation. Having experienced the love of God in Christ Jesus, Paul saw that sin was at bottom a matter of violating love rather than law; so that love became his axiomatic basis for ethics.

Dr. Knox explains Paul's difficulty in answering the antinomian argument by

reference to the fact that he shifted the emphasis from the ideas of repentance and forgiveness to the ideas of "justification" and "reconciliation." But however this shift may have helped to set law and grace "in a wholly antithetical relation which has had fateful consequences in the history of the church," the root of the trouble lies not in this antithesis but in the weakness of human nature. Paul occupies the highest spiritual ground when he makes God's grace the sole basis of ethical obligation—ground so high that Christians have always been tempted to follow the Galatians in reverting to legalism.

Paul did not enjoy being *gerecht und Sünder zugleich*, and the facile healing that puts conscience to sleep today by quoting statistics to prove that all other men are sinners too would only have increased his groaning to be delivered "from this body of death." The explanation of his seeming disuse of the ideas of repentance and forgiveness lies in the seriousness with which he took the new concept of being dead with Christ to sin. He did not claim perfection, but neither did he relax the tension between the requirements of this death and the hard facts of everyday experience. Be what you are—dead to sin: that was the relentless challenge to his conscience as enlightened by the Spirit and the mind of Christ.

The only proof that the love of Christ is the sole and adequate ground of ethical obligation is Christian action that includes both the reconciliation of individuals to God and their reconciliation with each other as members of human society. In proportion as this dual aim of the Christian gospel is accomplished, the kingdom of God is realized within history. If Christians today have faith to act upon the hypothesis that this is possible, historians writing two thousand years from now can say of them what Dr. Knox so justly says in summing up the life of Paul: "In him was fulfilled

in a conspicuous way the word of Christ: 'Greater works than these will he do, because I go to the Father.'

RAYMOND T. STAMM

Christ. By Maximilian Beyer. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. 277 pages. \$5.00.

The author has not subjected himself to the basic discipline of becoming acquainted with the rich library of New Testament critical research before he departed to present his own thesis. That thesis could have been set forth in a modest article on the psychological principles which come to light in Jesus' healing method. The author would thus have avoided insulting the faith and intelligence of his readers, to say nothing of making himself somewhat ridiculous.

His basic point of view seems to be the ancient heresy that Jesus repudiated utterly the Jahve-concept of the Old Testament religion and substituted a new Father-God. In so doing he discarded also the characteristic concept of sin found in traditional Judaism, which is, as he contends, that "sin is rooted in and prompted by the desires of hunger and sex." Jesus is pictured as discovering how many ills of men are due to "functional, mental, or emotional disorders" which "disorganize the individual's system and conduct in direct proportion in which the individual's knowledge deviates from reality." Christ's method of healing was to remove these erroneous concepts, particularly by releasing from the minds of the sick "a portion of the mass of guilt and fear placed there by the Judaistic concept of sin and the Jahve concept of deity."

In the course of preparing for and illustrating this doctrinaire point of view, the author is somehow able to derive the following portrait of Christ from his New Testament sources. He starts with the conviction that the gospels reflect "the unholy hate, violence, and distortion evidenced in the gangster-like behavior of that minority which gained Constantine's

ear and support at the Council of Nicaea." Matthew and John, however, are the reports of eye-witness disciples. The Holy Ghost is the ancient God of fire which Luke brought into Christianity from his heathen background, the God "whose outstanding activity had been to cause human virgins to conceive out of wedlock." The idea of conception by the Holy Ghost was necessary "to get rid of the sinfulness Judaism traditionally ascribed to all sexual acts and their results." Jesus was actually born out of wedlock because of an irregular pre-marital relationship between Mary and Joseph. When the latter returned to Nazareth they were "confronted with rebuilding their reputation from the ground up"; "they had to start a comeback to social and religious respectability." It was this very "struggle against the tides of an adverse public opinion which improved their mind" and through them the mind of Jesus. As a boy Jesus had to endure the stigma of being taunted as illegitimate. But with the help of his father Joseph, he was kept from "becoming a psychological problem and enabled to see the gloomy weakness of the Jewish concept of sin."

Jesus and John the Baptist are imagined as boys growing up together. The latter's baptismal rite is traced to "a hygienic effort to induce the Jewish masses to overcome their deep-seated aversion to taking a bath." John's fasting, which Jesus at first adopted, led the latter in the wilderness into a physical-mental condition in which the good judgment of his mind was temporarily destroyed so that he thought he could turn stones into bread. Similarly, the idea that he could obtain power over the kingdoms of the world indicated delusions of grandeur such as often accompany mental sickness.

The author has a predilection for the gospel of John. On this basis and because he feels that it would have taken many years for Jesus to convert many to his heretical ideas, it is reasoned that Jesus' ministry must have lasted for twenty

years until the latter was about fifty years old. In discussing Christ's break with Old Testament ideas, the author refers to the Adam and Eve story and God's command not to eat of the fruit of the garden as meaning that God forbade them to use their procreative organs. Similarly Jahve is seen as commanding fasting because of his inability to satisfy man's legitimate hunger—and demanding animal sacrifices as a means of securing for himself that which he denied to men.

It is reasoned that when Jesus' fellow-citizens at Nazareth did not recognize him, it was because he had been away many years, probably in India, where he picked up the Golden Rule, the Buddhist idea of eating and drinking the blood of a God, and the notion of re-incarnation, which Christ translated into the idea of the Second Coming. The real intent of the Lord's Supper was to present "an object lesson to demonstrate his renunciation of the fast custom and to insist that his Father in Heaven did not object to his children approaching him on a full stomach." The Gethsemane prayer and the cry of despair from the Cross are rejected because they portray "a Jesus convulsed with agony like some emotionally disordered Judaist."

The Resurrection is interpreted as "a deathlike trance Christ induced in himself in order to ease his pain." When his body was later carried away, the jolting revived him to such an extent that Joseph of Arimathea noticed it and therefore secluded Christ in his tomb, which then became a kind of hospital where he was nursed to life. By the third day he had recovered sufficiently to move about. The stone was rolled away so that he might get fresh air and walk in the garden. But he was still so weak, weary, and pathetic that even his own disciples did not recognize him—until he showed them the back of his hand.

It is a pity that such a caricature is foisted in print upon an uncritical reading public.

W. C. BERKEMEYER

From the Nile to the Waters of Damascus. By W. Arndt. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1949. 143 pages. \$2.00.

"My aim has not been to produce a very learned book. . . . The book is intended to be of a popular nature," writes the author in his preface. This work is a simply written travelogue of the author's tour (1947) as a consultant of Church-Craft Pictures. Its principal merit is the service it may render in certain areas of the church's educational program in providing an elementary acquaintance with the ancient Biblical world. It has nothing to say concerning the tremendous issues of contemporary Palestine, nor does it deal with current archeological activity there.

J. W. HEIKKINEN

The History of the Primitive Church. By Jules Lebreton and Jaques Zeiller. Translated from the French by Ernest C. Messenger. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. 2 vols. 1272 pages. \$16.50.

These two volumes are the first of a series of twenty-four volumes designed to cover the entire history of the church. They deal with the early church up to A. D. 311.

The two authors, each responsible for specific sections, are competent authorities in their spheres. They have taken into account all the significant literature on this field. There are frequent references, especially to French and German scholars, with occasional side glances to Anglicans. Men like Harnack, Lietzmann, and Duchesne are mentioned often, but the bulk of the references are to French scholars, many of whom are little known in this country. Perhaps one of the chief contributions of these books is that they introduce us to the rich French scholarship in church history.

The volumes have been translated into good, readable English, though there are places where the language is cumbersome, and at times it obscures the thought.

Like so many continental historical works, this is cut up into a good many sections. This often destroys historical connection and separates matters that belong together, though it may be commendable from a purely scholarly point of view. It also makes frequent repetitions necessary. But this may be due in part to the dual authorship. The pages are numbered consecutively throughout both volumes. It is also supplied with a detailed table of contents, index, and chronological tables, making it convenient for reference.

Scientific cogency is less apparent than in Duchesne, but propaganda is more obvious. Protestantism has been appealing to the ancient so-called uncorrupted church for its justification. Now renaissance Catholicism is out to capture the ancient church. The Roman Church claims that its theology, its dualistic and ascetic views of Christian life, as well as its practices are anchored in the New Testament and in the early Fathers. This is a challenge to Protestantism not to rest on past accomplishments in these fields. It is a decided mistake for Lutheranism to go no further back than to the Reformation for its justification. It is against the precepts as well as the examples of the Reformers.

There is in these volumes a dishonest use of such words as "tradition," "liturgy," "hierarchy," and "priests." These words, which nowadays have a definite connotation, are used without definition to cover meanings quite at variance with modern usage. The primitive church, it is said, had a "hierarchy." But on page 1116 we find the admission that the early Christian system was a brotherhood of churches rather than a hierarchical system (how true!) and that this idea is still found in the third century. On page 1119 the "beginnings of the hierarchical system" are traced to the establishment of the metropolitan sees "which incidentally do not seem to have been established as an actual and official institution before the fourth century" (p. 1119). That is,

by the author's own admission, there was no hierarchy in the primitive church.

The truth is that in the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods the early church can hardly be said to have had a clergy in the modern sense. It had congregational officers and spiritual men. There was for a long time no organization over and above the congregations. Even the apostles can hardly be said to have been general church officials. They were traveling missionaries, personal representatives of the Lord, and witnesses, especially of the resurrection. Their authority was that of the Word, not of an office. It is obvious that the word "hierarchy" in its usual sense cannot be made to apply to the first part of this period.

Even the primitive church is said to have had a "liturgy." The gatherings of Christians in Acts are said to have a "liturgical" character. Surely the word is stretched to the breaking point, especially with regard to the apostolic church (see I Cor. 14). However, it is admitted with reference to the last part of this period (A. D. 311) that the "liturgy" was largely "extemporized."

There is a constant glorification of tradition. It is at least equal to the Scriptures, practically above them. The source of Irenaeus' insight is traced to "respect and love for tradition, tradition as a whole" (p. 690), instead of to the Scriptures. Tradition is inspired; it is a stream of life "which is transmitted by the Spirit of God, and fecundates and renews the Church continually" (p. 831). It is the "testimony of the Spirit" (p. 707). Effort is made to show that in spite of occasional aberrations, things went well where men lived and worked under the authority of the church and tradition. Serious errors are traced to isolation of individual thinkers. The following definition is given (p. 679): "Tradition consists not merely in the perpetuity of the testimony which, by the regular succession of bishops, goes back to the Apostles and to Christ; it is a living chain, this testimony of the Spirit, that witnesses to and assures our union

with Christ, not only by faithful acceptance of his doctrine, but also by the communication of life." The word tradition seems to be used in various meanings. For instance, on p. 679 it seems to mean the Gospel as it is being preached in the church.

The subject of authority is of course extensively dealt with. The books are permeated with authoritarianism. Every occasion, even doubtful ones (p. 421 ff.), is utilized for this purpose. The art of the ministry is "the art of ruling souls" (p. 1104). Above the theologians and the faithful is the supreme judge of all conflicts—council, pope (p. 1085). Bishops are "the incarnation of the Church" (p. 1107). It exists completely in them. This would seem to favor episcopalianism. While the author leans heavily on Cyprian, he has, also, a great deal of trouble with him, for episcopalianism and papalism are mutually exclusive. However, it is maintained that episcopalianism is insufficient for the unity of the church. The only institution that will insure that is papacy.

The present emphasis on the unity of the church as an organic unity affords a great advantage to the Roman Catholic Church. It stands ready with what it believes to be the key to that unity, and its logic seems impressive to a great many people. The Protestant Churches had better come back to the stress of the Confessions of the Reformation on spiritual unity as the true and only valid unity. Organic union is a matter of convenience. It may be an advantage where true unity exists. It may be a disadvantage where it is not present.

All authority, of course, centers in Rome even at this early date. On page 699 we read: "The universal Church as a whole experienced the attraction of Rome and was subject to its authority."

As to some of the details: The book of Acts gets quite a fair and sensible treatment. The discussion of the Apostolic Fathers is full and valuable. Gnosticism is somewhat disappointing. But the treat-

ment of Irenaeus is on the whole especially excellent. However, with the strong devotion of the author to "tradition" as he understands it, he naturally overlooks that "tradition" in Irenaeus often means the same as the Rule of Faith. There is a fundamental difference between an authoritative tradition and a confession.

Much space is devoted to the progress of theological thinking. Even such men as Tertulian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen receive a sympathetic treatment. For history of doctrine this work is more satisfactory than Duchesne.

Cyprian, except for his episcopalianism, is right up the author's alley. He quotes Cyprian on Matthew 16:18 but relegates to the notes the fact that Cyprian in that connection bestows the same authority upon the other apostles as upon Peter—a fact which disqualifies Cyprian as supporter of the papal assumptions. To Cyprian the bishop of Rome was merely a *primus inter pares*.

We are told (p. 1123) that with "Victor, more than with any of his predecessors, the Roman bishop already acted as pope." True, but it indicates that his predecessors were not aware of such claims to authority. It reminds us of the fact that the pope's high-handed procedure at this time called forth vigorous protests from his fellow bishops who were apparently ignorant of the fact that the Roman bishop was the bishop of bishops, from whom they derived their own authority. But it is stated that "these voices were raised in the name of charity and for the sake of brotherhood [true] and they did not deny Rome's right to act [doubtful]."

Zephyrinus and Callixtus, who fell into grave errors regarding the Trinity, are nevertheless put down (p. 1124) as "guardians of the pure doctrine by reason of their office," certainly a case where the guardians failed to guard, or even to comprehend the error. Harnack's assertion that Zephyrinus issued a dogmatical statement in favor of Unitarianism is simply brushed aside with the assertion

(unproven) that Zephyrinus "was completely orthodox and in no wise approved of Unitarianism" (p. 703, note). The doctrinal delinquencies of Zephyrinus and Callixtus are excused by saying that, while they were opposing monarchian teaching, they did not want to adopt the logos theology (p. 1124)—at least a charitable way of explaining Callixtus' doctrinal monstrosity, which is quoted in another connection (p. 736). The real issue in this history is the historical foundation of the Roman primacy. All of Chapter XXXI is devoted to this.

One can appreciate the difficulties of the authors, who are trying to exercise scholarly breadth and impartiality, and at the same time defend all Roman assumptions. But in spite of its shortcomings, this is an important work which is going to have great influence, not only in church history, but perhaps also in the general historical field. It may accomplish the same thing for this period as Janssen and others have done for the Middle Ages and the Reformation. (I have spoken of "author" in the singular, since each one is responsible for definite sections.)

IVER IVERSEN

Die Geschichte der Abendmahlsfrömmigkeit in Zeugnissen und Berichten. By Hans Preuss. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1949. 301 pages. DM 15.

The author of this interesting and important book is professor of Theology at Erlangen. The book itself is, however, not a formal theological or doctrinal treatise, but is rather a historical survey of the manifold types and expressions of piety related to the Lord's Supper. This survey is made by means of selected paragraphs from a wide range of literature, ancient and modern, including confessional statements and official pronouncements, but for the most part consisting of statements of a less formal character taken from sermons, devotional books, diaries, letters, biographies, poems, church and mission reports, etc. Following an introductory chapter of about twenty pages, the main body of the book is made up of 380 sec-

tions of such material, the average length of which is about two-thirds of a page. A full documentation is given at the head of each section, and this should provide useful bibliographical information for any one wishing to pursue the study further. As it stands, the volume should rate as a valuable documentary source-book for such study.

The arrangement of material is partly by periods or centuries and partly according to the major divisions of Christendom, or rather by a combination of the two. A few of the twenty-three chapter headings will illustrate the method: "The Lord's Supper of the Early Catholic Church" (III); "... of the Middle Ages" (V); "The Lord's Supper of Luther and in the Lutheranism of the 16th Century" (VI); "The Lord's Supper of Pietism" (X); "... in the Period of German Idealism (XII); "The Lutheran Lord's Supper in the 19th Century" (XVII). The last two chapters of the book will doubtless be of special interest to many. In Chapter XXII, "Problematic Aspects of the Lord's Supper at the Present Time," will be found illustrated many of the problems which arise in our own as well as in German churches. (It should be noted that the author almost exclusively confines his attention to Germany and German literature.) Matters of liturgical practice, questions as to the use of white bread or wafers, and of non-alcoholic wine, problems of non-attendance and of superstitious attitudes and magical practices—all these and others are dealt with in connection with actual church situations. The last chapter (XXIII) on "The Lutheran Lord's Supper at the Present Time" gives some refreshing and reassuring expressions of faith and devotion, largely from war-time Germany. Two examples follow: "The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the proof of the genuineness of faith in the incarnation. . . . We eat the bread not symbolically but really. And we receive from God's hand no token, but the thing itself" (Elert). "One can forget Christ in the sermon. In the Lord's Supper one

can not forget him. . . . A church which does not always rally around the Lord's Supper is bound to become secularized. . . . Without the Lord's Supper there is no church" (Sasse).

In the first chapter of the book Professor Preuss sums up the significance of the whole collection of material, and in the following (translated) paragraphs gives expression to his own point of view:

"Luther's work was a call to action. Hence he liberated the sacrament, too, from all that was not of its essential character, especially from the fetters of the idea of sacrifice. He put all his gigantic strength to it to offer the Gospel pure again as it had been given. And for that reason nothing about the Roman transformation of the Lord's Supper was so hateful to him as the perversion of the gift of God to men into a gift of men to God, the changing of a sacrament into a sacrifice. Everything else, if need be, he could allow to be of value, not this (although he had mightily inveighed against the arbitrary withdrawal of the cup). And thus Luther first rediscovered, disclosed, made free, and set upon a firm footing the significance of the holy meal as a self-offering of Christ for the forgiveness of sins. If the East saw in the Eucharist the gift of immortal life, and the West the propitiatory gift of the church to her Lord, . . . if the mystics enjoyed in the Lord's Supper a blissful mystical merging into one another with Jesus, Luther established the forgiveness of sins as the Alpha and the Omega of the holy transaction, exactly as Christ had ordered it. Forgiveness of sins is beginning and end, the main point, the thing itself."

"Thereby the piety of the Lord's Supper becomes strongly personal. The Lord's Supper is no longer an overflowing into the sea of immortality, still less a performance, an offering, but it is the community (not amalgamation) of sinning but penitent and believing souls with their real, present Redeemer, a happiness in full, clear consciousness, no heavenly intoxication, also no *tremendum mysterium*,

but the joyous festival of believers—as in the primitive church."

JOHN K. LINN

Let God Be God! By Philip Watson. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949. 203 pages. \$2.50.

This book is a study of a particular theme in the theology of Luther. It is not concerned with the history, or the theological influence, or the present status of Luther's doctrine of God; it is a painstaking, superbly annotated source-study. Its great importance is this: it makes brilliantly clear the fallacy in the common assumption that Luther's understanding of the first article in theology stood in uncriticized continuity with the Roman tradition, and that his theological creativity lay only in the areas of Christology and Soteriology. It may, indeed, be said that although Luther's recovery of the Gospel was, to be sure, a process originating in those embattled areas, a vivid un-Roman God-picture informed his entire understanding of the Christian Faith.

Luther's originality is to be found in the fact that he took God as God with shattering, holy seriousness! This primary and central bowing of the mind and heart and will to the holy One who is creator, lover, and seeker of rebellious men, source of forgiveness and of eternal life, is the heart of his life and thought. Every operation of his theology, every strange aspect of his life and utterance, is to be understood from the blazing fact of the *Godhead* of God. All categories of theological explication which he thought not proper as adequate to this holy "givenness" of God he esteemed not only useless but perverse.

Particularly acute is the chapter in which Watson marshals Luther's statements to illuminate the Reformer's theology of revelation. If contemporary Lutheran thinking about the Word of God would attend to this magnificently scriptural exposition of the nature of God's revelation, enormous spiritual vitalities for the gathering together of our needlessly

scattered family would be released. It is even possible that something better than another report by a committee's scraping over past misunderstandings might happen to us.

There is, at the moment, an alive interest in the theology of the Reformers. Many men, motivated by veneration and by piety but unsupported by vigorous source-study, are launching paper boats upon the turbulent sea. This is no paper-boat. It is bound together with the most astonishing and discerningly chosen mass of citations this reviewer has ever encountered in a special monograph.

JOSEPH SITTLER, JR.

En Farled. By Elis Malmström. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyreles bokförlag, 1949. 160 pages. Kr. 5:75.

This is a collection of addresses and articles delivered and published during the past decade. The first is a warm and moving description of Luther's dying faith and constitutes an address delivered on the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's death. There are two fine chapters on Carl von Linné which give incisive and comprehensive insights into his life and thought. Persons with a special interest in Swedish hymnody will find the section on Samuel Ödmann informative. Olof Olson's departure from Sweden for Kansas is depicted with charm and appreciation. It provides a telling insight into the piety and devotion of one of the founders of the Augustana Lutheran Church. S. A. Fries is not one of the greatest names in Swedish theology, though he had considerable importance as one of the earliest champions of Ritschlianism in Sweden, but he is probably the only theologian who expounded Ritschl, the Wellhausen hypothesis, and Adolph Harnack's view of history in letters to his fiancé.

There are six essays, all of them reprinted from other publications, dealing with such subjects as "Is a Biological View of Life Adequate?" "The Communist Manifesto," "The Tolerance and Intolerance of Love," "Our Only Alterna-

tive" (the implications of Russian encroachment in Czechoslovakia), "Getting Along With People," "Our Land and Our People." They are excellently written and thought-provoking presentations. Malmström has a fine literary style and a thoroughly evangelical point of view. In addition to several devotional and theological works, he is the author of two successful novels.

EDGAR M. CARLSON

Der Weg des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.

By Hermann Ullmann. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1949. 252 pages. DM 10.20.

Dr. Ullmann's book is a fascinating expedition through European history from the time of the French Revolution until the present day. Actually the frightful happenings of the last decades evoked the book. It deals chiefly with the question, how the world could have been plunged into such a disaster as the last war, how it was possible that this war could have happened.

The author sees the cause of the catastrophe in mankind's detachment from God. The beginnings of this separation were already present when Louis XIV said, "*L'état c'est moi*," because he embodied not only the state but also the nation, which has become the "Ersatz-religion." This process of evolution found its continuation in the French Revolution, when the tie no longer was the monarchy, the church, and tradition, but the nation. The nation here becomes synonymous with the conception of the sovereign people. The masses are mobilized in the struggle against monarchy and reaction and in the battle against foreign powers. Dr. Ullmann defines the masses in the words of Bishop Gerhard May, of Vienna: "Masse ist Volk ohne Gott." In these words also is expressed the basic tenet of the book. When a people detaches itself from God, from tradition, from its historical destiny, the road lies open to catastrophe by way of self-glorification and self-deification.

To this confusion of the times there is

a counter-pole. This is England. Only in England is resistance offered to the tendencies of the French Revolution. This resistance finds expression in the English statesman and politician, Edmund Burke. From concrete experience, not from theory, Burke discovers the nation, which justifies itself not through the state alone, but through the people as a community of fellow beings of common descent, common convictions, and common historical destiny.

In Germany one wished to check "western" nationalism, but on a purely worldly basis, by means of secular philosophy. Kant initiated the experiment, which led by way of Fichte's idealistic nationalism to Hegel's dialectical relativism. Through misinterpretation both the advocates of the liberal power state on the one hand and the Marxists on the other appeal to Hegel as their authority. Otto von Bismarck towers up as the personality in Germany who recognized a most dangerous situation and attempted a rescue. The idea of the national state became suspect to him through its association with liberalism. His search for another way led Bismarck to the founding of the German Reich after Versailles. Here the German people acquired a powerful political nucleus under the leadership of Prussia. The German Reich, however, was no national state. It was a structure with its own special form, sprung from the necessity of creating a vital political nucleus between two old European national states, the Hapsburg Empire, composed of many nationalities, and the Russian Empire. Thus Bismarck succeeded for a time in banning the evil spirits. But already toward the end of his life—Bismarck died in 1889—he had to witness how his creation, the German Reich, was hurrying inexorably toward catastrophe. The "psychologische Masse," no longer believing in God, uprooted, and trained to self-glorification, was made use of as a means to the attainment of practical goals.

Dr. Ullmann begins his analysis of World War I with an utterance of the

chief of the Austrian General Staff, Conrad von Hötzendorf: "He who wishes to understand this war must realize that it was not a war of generals but a war of masses and material means." The war was a clash between the old nations and the territorial states of the old stamp, whose kernel was the German people. Once more the masses play a deciding role by allowing themselves to be swayed to warmaking. Then when the war is lost, it is again the masses in Germany who revolt. After the peace treaties of World War I it is evident that a people represents a historical power. Peoples, not supported by states and not enclosed in national states but bound together by spiritual fellowship, make history in this age. But just this realization, in conjunction with the utilization of the typical characteristics of the masses, forms the kernel of the national socialist movement which must lead to a second world war.

"Volk ist Masse ohne Gott." This sentence contains the thesis of this book. When a people, without God, without ties, and casting off tradition, becomes "Masse," it is on the way to destruction. Expressed positively, it must mean that when a people does not degenerate to "Masse," it avoids destruction.

Throughout this summary it is chiefly Dr. Ullmann himself who is speaking. It has not been possible to take into account more than a small fraction of the overwhelming mass of ideas set forth and expressed in noble and moving language. The book is eminently worth reading, but he must be warned who is seeking in this book an easily readable review of the course of the nineteenth century. The author's knowledge and wealth of ideas are great, and they are deposited in this book. An index and reading list would enhance the value of the volume.

OTHO NOTHHACKSBERGER

Karl Gützlaff als Missionar in China. By Herman Schlyter. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946. 318 pages.

This is the first comprehensive account

of the life and work of the celebrated missionary pioneer in China. Dr. Schlyter points out that there have been three types of missionaries: those who serve missionary societies, those who serve the church, and individual or free missionaries. Gützlaff belonged to the last class. Hudson Taylor is also a striking example of a free missionary, but Gützlaff preceded him by a whole generation and was his acknowledged model.

This thorough and scholarly narrative, therefore, presents an important pioneer in the history of missions. It delineates an important phase of missionary method. The life of Gützlaff covers the first half of the nineteenth century, 1803-1851, and was the inspiration to many a young man both in Europe and America to give his life to the foreign missionary enterprise. Among these was David Livingstone.

Gützlaff was born in Pomerania, Germany, was early influenced by Pietistic circles and Moravians, studied at the University of Berlin, caught the imaginative and venturesome spirit of Romanticism, trained as a missionary in Holland, visited London and met Morrison, determined to go to China, but began work among the Chinese in Sumatra.

Then after a short period each in Java and Siam, he traveled the coast of China for three years and in 1833 went into the interior. He soon combined his evangelistic work with political and economic interests, and this seriously interfered with his work as a missionary. He busied himself with a translation of the Bible into Chinese and wrote books to arouse interest among Europeans and Americans, but he was always an individual missionary and made no plans to organize congregations or establish a church.

After 1839 he was engaged in the British Colonial Service, chiefly as interpreter, was stationed at Hongkong, and could give only part of his time to missionary endeavors. He organized his native helpers into the Chinese Union, which by 1849 numbered 200 preachers and about 900 other Christian workers. In

1849 and 1850 he visited Europe and aroused great enthusiasm at many places for missions in China, and numerous associations were formed to aid in the work. A few months after his return to China he died, only forty-eight years old. The Chinese Union soon died also.

The real completion of Gützlaff's plans was carried out by Hudson Taylor, who was sent out in 1853 by the Gützlaff Association in London. Hudson never tried to conceal his dependence upon Gützlaff and called him "the grandfather of the China Inland Mission."

This fascinating story is told in clear terms and with thorough documentation. It is well balanced in its judgments and indulges in no hero-worship. The interpretation is excellent. The narrative is based upon very thorough research in Germany and England. It is accompanied by an extensive bibliography of 231 titles, an index of names, and a twelve-page summary in English.

Dr. Schlyter has placed in his debt all students of missionary history and biography.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Resans mål var Kina. By Oscar Rundblom. Stockholm, 1949. 96 pages. Kr. 3:25.

This is a brief story of a journey from Sweden to China via the United States. The author was sent out in 1948 by the Church of Sweden to become superintendent of the mission in Hunan. He came to the field just in time to meet the Communist advance which led to the capture of Changsha. Most of the missionaries had to be evacuated to Hongkong. The author presents some vivid pictures both of the trip out and of the church situation as the people were preparing for the change of government. Since he had spent some time in China before, he was able to see and interpret the situation quite accurately. Even though the present seems dark, he expresses his confidence that the church in China will continue

and grow in spite of opposition and persecution.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

Världsstrategi, Kristliga Studentvärldsförbundet. By Suzanne de Dietrich. Stockholm: 1949. 185 pages. Kr. 5:00.

The title "World Strategy" refers to the dreams, plans, and accomplishments of the World's Student Christian Federation's fifty years. The book is printed in Sweden with a foreword by the translator, Birgit Rohde. The authoress, a French Protestant who was trained as an engineer but became one of the traveling secretaries early in Federation history, is now on the faculty of the World Council's Ecumenical Institute at Bossey.

This brief volume is an attempt at a general historical survey and interpretation of the oldest ecumenical movements. The origins are traced to the student Christian groups that began flourishing at church colleges and universities in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The missionary interest on the part of students at Yale, Princeton, Cornell, and other schools was largely responsible for the world outreach of a few leaders. Thus John R. Mott became the guiding spirit in calling together representatives of national student Christian movements in Vadstena, Sweden, in 1895. During the next twenty-five years, as general secretary of the Federation, Dr. Mott was the chief character in the geographic, confessional, and racial spread of the move-

ment. This book tries to evaluate Mott as a student leader of that generation.

The development of the second quarter-century is more difficult to describe both because of its immediacy and the irregularity of the Christian thinking among students. The protests against creeds, the burning interest in social reform and a preoccupation with pacifism, and the confusion of those who questioned the value of missions as a Christian goal characterized not only American movements but also many others. New emphasis on evangelical depth came from Germany through Hanns Lilje and Reinold von Thadden, both leaders in German Protestantism today, and from Holland through W. A. Visser't Hooft. Not mentioned in this book, but quite important for the WSCF today, was the emerging church-related student movements in the United States, like the Lutheran Student Association, which sought and gained the dominant role in student religious life—the place once held by the student YMCA's and YWCA's.

The leadership of Robert Mackie, now reconstruction secretary for the World Council, emphasizes the fact that most churchmen active in ecumenical movements were once Federation people. In its service to the church the Federation has been captivated by the missionary motivation and has also stirred student generations to a greater emphasis on evangelism in the universities of the world.

CARL E. LUND-QUIST

Books Received

- Eric H. Wahlstrom, *The New Life in Christ*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950. 295 pages. \$3.00.
- Olaf Moe, *The Apostle Paul: His Life and His Work*. Translated from the Norwegian by L. A. Vigness. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 577 pages. \$4.75.
- F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*. Translated from the German by T. Engelder. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. Volume I. 577 pages. \$3.50.
- M. Reu, *Homiletics. A Manuel of the Theory and Practice of Preaching*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. (Reprint of edition of 1924.) 639 pages. \$3.50.
- Hanns Lilje, *The Valley of the Shadow*. Translated from the German by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950. 128 pages. \$1.35.
- Walter A. Maier, *One Thousand Radio Voices for Christ*. Radio Messages of the Fifteenth Lutheran Hour. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 454 pages. \$3.00.
- Gerald Heard, *Is God in History?* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. 269 pages. \$3.00.
- Frederick C. Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 339 pages. \$3.75.
- David A. MacLennan, *A Preacher's Primer*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. 113 pages. \$1.50.
- Gerald Kennedy, *The Lion and the Lamb. Paradoxes of the Christian Faith*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 233 pages. \$2.50.
- Elis Malmeström, *J. A. Ecklund, en biografi*. Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 394 pages. Kr. 14:50.
- Philip H. Lotz, ed., *Orientation in Religious Education*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 618 pages. \$6.50.
- Eliot Hodgkin, ed., *A Pictorial Gospel. A Life of Christ in the Works of the Old Masters*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. 212 pages. \$3.50.
- Bernhard, H. J. Habel, *Snapshots*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 167 pages. \$1.25.
- Corliss, Lamont. *The Illusion of Immortality*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Second edition. 316 pages. \$3.95.
- Albert C. Knudson, *Basic Issues in Christian Thought*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 220 pages. \$2.75.
- Ragnar Bring, *Kristendoms Tolkningar*. Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 327 pages. Kr. 12:50.
- Nolan B. Harmon, *Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. Revised edition. 215 pages. \$2.50.
- O. A. Geiseman, *Old Truths for a New Day*. Volume II. Sermons on the Epistles. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 253 pages. \$2.50.

CONTRIBUTORS

ALVIN N. ROGNESS is pastor of the Trinity Congregation (Evangelical Lutheran Church) in Mason City, Iowa.

LUTHER D. REED, president-emeritus of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is chairman of the Joint Lutheran Commission on Liturgy.

ERNEST E. RYDEN, editor of the *Augustana Lutheran*, Rock Island, Illinois, is secretary of the Joint Commission on a Common Hymnal.

VICTOR E. BECK is pastor of the Gustavus Adolphus Lutheran Church (Augustana) in New York City.

ERIC STEINTHAL, a physician, is a member of Christ Lutheran Church (U.L.C.A.) in Newburgh, New York.

ERIC WAHLSTROM is professor of New Testament in the Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois.

E. C. FENDT is professor of systematic theology in and Dean of Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio, and was a member of the committee whose report is interpreted in his article.

EDWARD W. UTHE is assistant pastor of the Church of the Reformation (U.L.C.A.) in Rochester, New York.

HAROLD A. DURFEE is chairman of the Department of Philosophy at Park College, Parkville, Missouri.

WILLIAM C. CONRADI (U.L.C.A.) is chaplain at Colorado State Hospital, Pueblo, Colorado.

Among the reviewers in this number are RAYMOND T. STAMM, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER, pastor of St. Matthew's Church, Bethlehem, Pa.; JACOB W. HEIKKINEN, associate professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; IVER IVERSEN, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; JOHN K. LINN, professor of the New Testament in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; JOSEPH SITTLER, JR., professor of Systematic Theology in Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; EDGAR M. CARLSON, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; ERIC H. WAHLSTROM, professor of the New Testament and Missions in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; CARL E. LUND-QUIST, assistant executive director of the National Lutheran Council in New York.